from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

SEC. 2. Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"3. The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) and of subsection 2 of this rule shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that this is a complete substitute for Senate Resolution 15?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is so submitted; yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. When it comes to voting, would perfecting amendments to the original text take precedence over the amendment in the nature of a substitute?

The VICE PRESIDENT. An amendment to the original text of the resolution takes precedence in the matter of voting before the substitute or any amendment to the substitute is voted upon. In other words, the original text for which the substitute is offered is open to perfecting amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is the substitute subject to debate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The substitute is subject to debate and amendment.

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may make a statement?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there is apparently now before us a complete new substitute, which has many ramifications and many new phases of law which make it entirely different from Senate Resolution 15. This is the first time that at least about 40 Senators in the Chamber have heard very much about the substitute. It seems to me that in order to give all Senators a fair opportunity to look over this new provision we should take a recess now and come in perhaps tomorrow at noon. That will give every Senator an opportunity seriously to consider the matter and come here with some idea and knowledge of what we should or should not do.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to say that I rose to ask for that very privilege—of studying the substitute resolution—because I have not seen it. I think Senators are entitled to study it before they are called upon to vote on it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no intention not to give the Senate an opportunity to discuss the substitute and to become acquainted with all its provisions. I did not know whether it was the intention of the majority leader to recess now or to proceed with the discussion. Certainly it is the intention of all those who have joined in submitting the substitute that all Senators be given all information about it. I heartily agree with the suggestion of the majority leader that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow noon. I am in complete accord with the suggestion, and I hope he will make the motion.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 16, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Father in Heaven, we thank Thee that back of this world house, back of our joys and afflictions, our perplexities and problems, back of the universe itself, is a good God of infinite mercy and power. Let us not doubt the divine will, which keeps this troubled world steadfast and sure.

We thank Thee for the infinite tenderness with which Thou hast blessed us, for home and church, for food and shelter, for religious liberty and the love of truth and honor.

May our daily pledge be to our conscience, our country, and our God, believing that the glorious earth is one great land with Thee as ruler, and eternal truth the only sword. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

TAX REFUNDS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this is income-tax day. It is the day in millions of homes when families are struggling with their final Federal tax returns for the calendar year 1948. For many it is a day of sweating and fretting as to where the money is to come from to pay the balance due the Government.

It is the one day in the year when the entire Nation should be keenly aware of the excessive cost of government in Washington, and of the burden of taxes, which today, in most families, takes almost as much out of the family income as the total rent bill every year.

And it is the day when tens of millions of families will compute for themselves the value of the tax-reduction bill passed by the Eightieth Congress, the Republican Congress which overcame and overrode three Presidential vetoes to give the American people a measure of tax relief.

Every day in recent months, the Federal Treasury has been mailing out an average of 100,000 tax-refund checks to people who have money coming back to them because of that tax cut passed over President Truman's vetoes in the Eightieth Congress. There are more than twenty-five million of these tax refunds going out between June 1948 and the end of the current fiscal year, June 30, 1949.

Mr. Speaker, those refund checks are substantial measures of relief today in millions of homes throughout America. They are in the mails only because the Republican Eightieth Congress enacted a tax cut. It may be the last tax cut given the American people in our times. If all the fabulous spending programs introduced in the present Congress were to be realized, Federal spending would be increased by $16,000,000,000 a year over the next 5 years.

Millions of families will be at least partially tided over 1949 by the tax refunds they are now getting because of the action of the Eightieth Congress. But next year there will be no such volume of refunds—for this Congress does not yet plan to give the American people a tax cut, as the last Republican Congress did. Next year the full burden of the Truman New Deal spending will fall upon the American people, for the Republicans have not the votes this year to overturn the administration's basic policy—to tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect.

Only the people can change this mania of Federal squandering.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY FAVORS ECONOMY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I approve what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has just said.

The Republican Party has traditionally been the party of economy and low taxes. If the Republicans had been returned to power by the last election our plan would have been to go much further with tax reduction and tax revision. We the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee had planned to present legislation that would repeal the excise tax on a number of commodities, such as

the tax on low-priced cosmetics and low-priced handbags. And also reduce materially the tax on telephone calls, telegrams, and transportation tickets. And also to make a substantial reduction in all excise taxes. These reductions should be made.

The Republicans in the Eightieth Congress were able to secure the passage in the House of a tax bill which is of tremendous importance. The bill was passed too late for the Senate to act.

For a number of years the Ways and Means Committee has maintained a very capable staff of experts. These experts, in collaboration with the experts of the United States Treasury, have for some time been working to relieve many inequities and inconsistencies that have developed in the tax laws of the country. They have found where nearly a hundred amendments to the general tax laws are absolutely necessary. They agreed on about 50, which they incorporated into the bill which I have just referred to. I was chairman of the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee appointed to make a general revision of the tax laws, and this bill was the product of our efforts.

I have reintroduced this bill, and it should pass this session of Congress. Many people who have suffered by reason of these inequities need relief. This bill will not raise or lower taxes to any great extent, but it will correct many injustices.

T-DAY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today, March 15, is an important day in the lives of millions of Americans. This is T-day—the last day during which 1948 income taxes can be paid.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to point out that in paying their 1948 income taxes today our citizens are finding—for the first time in many years—that their income-tax burden has been reduced.

In fact some seven million Americans, who, in previous years were required to pay taxes on their low earnings, do not have to pay any tax on their 1948 incomes. Millions of married couples are finding their income-tax assessments have been greatly reduced, in many cases by as much as 30 percent. All other Americans are finding that their income-tax burdens on 1948 earnings have been reduced.

This happy result is no accident, nor is it because of anything the administration in power has done.

The lower income taxes effective today are the legislation enacted by the Republican Eightieth Congress over the veto of the President. The Republicans in the Eightieth Congress, just as do the Republicans in the Eighty-first Congress, were and are strong believers in governmental economy and in the lower taxes to be gained by economy. The Republican Eightieth Congress cut both Government spending and taxes. The Republicans in this Eighty-first Congress are demanding reduced Government spending and repeal of wartime excise taxes. They are opposed to the President's program of heavier Government expenditures and greatly increased taxes on the people.

Today—T-day—is a good time for the people of the United States to stop and ponder a while over the financial situation and policies of our Government. Today is a good time for them to decide whether they want the economy and efficiency in Government—and lower taxes, under a Republican program—or the continuation of the New Deal policy of tax and tax and tax, and spend and spend and spend, which threatens both the solvency and the future of this Nation.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, "The good that men do lives after them"—of course, this saying should be amended and when applied to the Eightieth Congress should then read "The good that the men and women did in the Eightieth Congress lives after them."

One of such "do goods" which affects the very foundation of our country is the preservation of marriage and home. The Eightieth Congress, in passing the tax-reduction law of 1948 wisely included the community-property tax provision.

To confirm the good in this instance, I wish to include in my remarks an item from the Hartford (Conn.) Times of March 14, 1949, which in all likelihood, is only one example of many unreported reconciliations or strengthening of marital ties. Surely the full effect of this tax proviso is incalculable in the light of all the possible ramifications on the marital ties of the husbands and wives of America, not mentioning the inevitable fact that the provision had been an added strong reason for new marriages.

Mr. Fitzpatrick is the collector of internal revenue for the State of Connecticut, with offices at 460 Capitol Avenue, Hartford.

The newspaper item is as follows:

COMMUNITY-PROPERTY TAX PROVISO BRINGS RECONCILIATION

The revised Federal income-tax law can play the role of Cupid as well as that of the traditional ogre. Take the word of Collector John J. Fitzpatrick for it.

As the filing of returns mounted in volume today on the next to the last day, Fitzpatrick said that in several cases the new opportunity to file joint returns had apparently brought about reconciliations between separated couples.

Proof of one reconciliation appeared at Capitol Avenue internal revenue headquarters this morning. Fitzpatrick told it this way:

"Last month a taxpayer in a high-income bracket came in alone for help. Asked if he was married, he said he was, but that subsequent to December 31 he and his wife separated."

Under the new community-property law, it was pointed out to the taxpayer, he and his wife could file jointly, thereby saving money, if they had been living together December 31, last day of the taxable year. If on or before the last day of the year they were divorced or legally separated, they are considered single for the entire year for tax purposes.

The taxpayer, warned that if he and his wife agreed to file jointly they must both sign the return, went away to think it over.

Today he returned with his wife, both smiling, and sought help in filing a joint document. They explained that while getting together to talk over their tax they also talked over other things and decided on a reconciliation.

Collector Fitzpatrick believes that several other reconciliations in the State had been similarly effected.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Woman's Home Companion.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances: in one to include an editorial appearing in the March 19 issue of the magazine America, and in the other to include a speech to be made by him at Cleveland.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and to include editorials and newspaper articles, and in one instance to include a statement made by him which was submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means on old-age pensions.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances: in one to include an editorial; and in the other to revise and extend his remarks and include a magazine article in the remarks he intends to make today.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address made by a constituent, Mr. Kent Leavitt, president of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article, Liberal or Conservative.

Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a gentleman in Delaware.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Selective Service System.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include newspaper articles and letters.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a certain magazine article.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter. I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost will be $159.75 but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some excerpts from certain letters relative to Federal expenditures.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

EZRA BUTLER EDDY, JR., AND WIFE, MARIE CLAIRE LORD EDDY

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 1700, for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the Immigration and Naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and his wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy, as of February 3, 1945, the date upon which they were admitted temporarily to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL FADEM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1993) for the relief of Samuel Fadem.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Samuel Fadem, who entered the United States lawfully at the port of New York on September 27, 1946. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the quota for Poland then current.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALASKA JUNEAU GOLD MINING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 583) for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., a corporation, of Juneau, Alaska, the sum of $80,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for crushed rock, building materials, and services furnished the United States for use in urgently needed defense projects, including construction of the subport of embarkation, air landing fields, and so forth, at Juneau, Alaska, and in the vicinity during the period from June 1, 1942, to February 1, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAMIE HURLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 594) for the relief of Mamie Hurley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 5, secs. 765–770), the Bureau of Employees' Compensation is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim o Mamie L. Hurley for compensation under such act, within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, on account of the death of her husband, Edwin L. Hurley, deceased, whose death on March 21, 1945, is alleged to have been the result of injuries, with consequent disability, received in August 1940, in the performance of his duty as a machinist in the Veterans' Administration at Kecoughtan, Va.; and the Bureau, after such consideration of such claim, shall determine and make findings of fact thereon and make an award for or against payment of compensation provided for in such act of September 7, 1916, as amended: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MATHEW C. COWLEY AND LOUISA COWLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 609) for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 155 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky.; and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 150 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky., are each, as such former owner or owners, hereby authorized to bring such suit or suits as each may respectively desire to so do against the United States of America, to recover damages, if any, for loss or losses, which they may have sustained or suffered, as such respective former owners, by reason of establishment, construction, or maintenance of Camp Knox in the State of Kentucky. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, consider, determine, and render judgments for the respective amounts of such damages, if any, as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by the said former owners of said farms, with the same right of appeal as in other cases, and notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitation: *Provided*, That such action will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LORENZO H. FROMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 610) for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Lorenzo H. Froman, former owner of a certain farm consisting of 165 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox, in Hardin County, Ky., is, as such former owner, hereby authorized to bring suit against the United States of America to recover damages, if any, for loss or losses which he may have sustained or suffered, as such owner, by reason of establishment, construction, or maintenance of Camp Knox in the State of Kentucky. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, consider, determine, and render judgment for the amount of any such damages, if any, as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by the said former owner of said farm, with the same right of appeal as in other cases, and notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitations: *Provided*, That such action will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIMS OF PROPERTY OWNERS ADJACENT TO FORT KNOX, KY.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 611) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment for the respective amounts of such damages as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by landowners who owned land in the vicinity of Fort Knox, Ky., prior to the time the Government acquired that site: *Provided*, That no claims shall be considered by the court of any landowner who acquired the property after the acquisition by the Government of this military reservation: *Provided further*, That such action or actions will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HARRIETT PATTERSON ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 637) for the relief of Mrs. Harriett Patterson Rogers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,800, to Mrs. Harriett Patterson Rogers, of Forrest City, Ark., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for a judgment rendered against her and in favor of Jess L. Bell and others in the Circuit Court of Pope County, Ark. Such claim arising out of an accident on June 14, 1941, while the said Mrs. Harriet Patterson Rogers was on official business for the United States Agriculture Extension Service in the State of Arkansas: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUISE PETERS LEWIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 683) for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds or property of the Government of Germany or of nationals of Germany in the possession or under the control of the Government of the United States or which may hereafter come into the possession or under the control of the United States, to Louise Peters Lewis of East Lynn, Mass., a native-born citizen of the United States, the sum of $10,000. Such sum represents the actual amount of the loss (without interest thereon) sustained by the said Louise Peters Lewis on account of the depreciation in value of certain First World War German securities owned by her and described in her claim (list No. 5242, Docket No. 7172) heretofore filed with, and dismissed by, the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. W. GREENWOOD, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1137) for the relief of J. W. Greenwood, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the accounts of J. W. Greenwood, Jr., former regional fiscal officer for the Central Administrative Services Division, Office for Emergency Management, Philadelphia, Pa., and he is hereby relieved from any liability to refund or pay to the United States the sum of $718.23, such sum being vouchers issued to enlisted personnel for travel expenses at the same rate as commissioned officers, whereas they were entitled to a lower rate under the Army regulations, and for other purposes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid no the table.

L. J. HOUZE CONVEX GLASS CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1461) for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COHEN, GOLDMAN & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1794) for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $19,030.20, in full settlement of all claims against the Government growing out of contracts numbered 1325, 1645, 2299, 3220, and 4519N, and contracts supplementary thereto, for the manufacture during 1917 and 1918 of overcoats and uniforms for the United States Army.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "Army", insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FLORENCE BYVANK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2463) for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay the amount of the insurance under the Government life insurance policy (No. K 720604) of Clarence A. Byvank to Florence Byvank, his widow and designated beneficiary, in accordance with the terms of such policy, beginning with the first calendar month following the month during which this act is enacted, notwithstanding the lapse of such policy in December 1931. The insured, Clarence A. Byvank, applied for reinstatement of such policy in February 1932 and transmitted payment for back premiums thereon at the time of application but died suddenly from monoxide gas poisoning on March 30, 1932, before a report of his medical examination had been filed with the Veterans' Administration.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN GIFTS AND A FOREIGN DECORATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 632) to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-named members and former members of the naval service are hereby authorized to accept such gifts as have been tendered them by foreign governments as of the date of approval of this act: Rear Adm. Harold M. Martin, United States Navy; Capt. William R. Brust, United States Naval Reserve; Capt. Bennett W. Wright, United States Navy; Capt. George C. Wright, United States Navy; Capt. Richard W. Ruble, United States Navy; Commander Robert F. Carmody, United States Navy; Commander James I. Cone, United States Navy; Commander Jack Dean, United States Navy; Commander Gordon Fowler, United States Navy; Commander Richard L. Fowler, United States Navy; Commander John E. Hausman, United States Navy; Commander Draper L. Kauffman, United States Navy; Commander James A. Knowlton, United States Naval Reserve; Commander John P. Lunger, United States Navy; Commander Robert M. Milner, United States Navy; Commander Frank G. Raysbrook, United States Navy; Commander Frederick M. Steisberg, United States Navy; Commander William A. Stuart, United States Navy; Commander Richard S. Rogers, United States Navy; Commander George R. Lee, United States Navy; Lt. Comdr. Raymond A. Boyd, United States Navy; Lt. Comdr. Laurenca B. Green, United States Navy; Lt. Comdr. Melvin C. Hoffman, United States Navy; Lt. Comdr. Victor A. Moitoret, United States Navy; Lt. Comdr. John C. O'Connor, United States Navy; Lt. Comdr. Henry Nelson, United States Naval Reserve; Lt. Comdr. Norman L. Paxton, United States Navy; Lt. Comdr. Byron G. Shepple, United States Navy; Capt. James J. Bott, United States Marine Corps; Lt. Irwin J. Vanderswag, United States Marine Corps; Lt. George H. Belk, United States Navy; Lt. Samuel Hopkins, Jr., United States Navy; Lt. Jack Scott, United States Navy; Lt. (jg) La Verne W. Brown, Jr., United States Navy; Lt. (jg) Leonard B. Di Napoli, United States Navy; Lt. (jg) Thomas L. Neilson, United States Navy; Lt. (jg) Horace A. Thomsen, United States Navy; Ensign Robert P. Armstrong, United States Navy; Chief Boatswain Anthony S. Ciccone, United States Navy; Boatswain Earl L. Hause, United States Navy; Joseph G. Pardovich, chief boatswain's mate, United States Navy; Robert D. Clendenon, chief musician, United States Navy; Carl F. Heine, chief machinist's mate, United States Navy; Gilbert H. Dobler, chief photographer's mate, United States Navy; Myrl A. Yeaman, chief photographer's mate, United States Navy; Crisanto Dolor, chief cook, United States Navy; Master Sergeant Lionel E. Simmons, United States Marine Corps; Willie F. Maquire, chief signalman, United States Navy; Donald K. Lobell, chief radioman, United States Navy; Gorman "T" Perry, motor machinist's mate, first class, United States Navy; Jack O. Montgomery, boatswain's mate, second class, United States Navy; Charles R. Dickinson, boatswain's mate, third class, United States Navy; Lawrence H.

Wasser, musician, third class, United States Navy; Gordon C. Wyman, fire controlman, third class, United States Navy; Robert Charles Vail, shipfitter, third class, United States Navy; Delmere B. Blackburn, private, first class, United States Marine Corps; Paul Hermann, seaman, first class, United States Navy; James E. McCall, seaman; first class, United States Navy; Charles H. Kilpatrick, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Clifford E. Kintner, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Bernard I. Landau, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Harold A. Master, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Kenneth Karl Hrabal, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Nicholas Vignovich, seaman, first class, United States Naval Reserve; Leonard Stanley Tur, fireman, first class, United States Naval Reserve; L. R. Weedle, fireman, first class, United States Navy; R. N. Young, fireman, first class, United States Navy; and Michael Strusinski, coxswain, United States Naval Reserve.

SEC. 2. The following-named members of the naval service are hereby authorized to accept such awards as have been tendered them by foreign governments as of the date of the approval of the act: Rear Adm. Edward W. Hansen, United States Navy; Capt. Albert E. Fitzwilliam, United States Navy; and Lt. (jg) John E. Nichols, United States Navy.

SEC. 3. Dr. Mina S. Rees, a civilian employee of the Navy Department, is hereby authorized to accept and wear the King's Medal for Service in the Cause of Freedom which has been tendered her by the Government of Great Britain.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEX BAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 668) for the relief of Alex Bail.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond in the case of Alex Bail, and is directed not to issue any further warrants or orders in the case of the alien based upon such alien's membership in the Communist Party prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDA WAHLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2704) for the relief of Freda Wahler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the civil-service retirement and disability fund, to Freda Wahler, of Freeport, Ill., the widow of William F. Wahler, formerly a railway mail clerk, an annuity equal in amount to the annuity which she would have been entitled to receive had William F. Wahler been promptly and properly advised by the Civil Service Commission of his rights as to retirement and had he upon receipt of the proper information elected in writing to receive a reduced annuity equal to such reduced annuity payable after his death to the said Freda Wahler as surviving beneficiary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACOB A. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 585) for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jacob A. Johnson, of Kodiak, Alaska, the sum of $15,103.94, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses heretofore sustained, or which may hereafter be sustained, by the said Jacob A. Johnson, on account of damages heretofore caused, or which may hereafter be caused, to his fox farm, located on Crooked Island, Alaska, by military, naval, and air force activity in that area: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE A. KIRCHBERGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 650) for the relief of George A. Kirchberger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That George A. Kirchberger, of Chicago, Ill., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States amounts paid to him for services as an employee of the Department of the Treasury, Bureau of Federal Supply, and as an employee of the Department of War during the period he was not eligible, because of citizenship requirements, to receive compensation from funds appropriated for such Departments. Any amounts heretofore (1) withheld from the said George A. Kirchberger (including any accrued salary for services performed and salary in lieu of accrued annual leave, but excluding the sum of $214.44, representing retirement deductions), and any sum withheld or required to be withheld pursuant to the provisions of subchapter D of chapter IX of the Internal Revenue Code, or (2) refunded to the United States by him, on account of such unauthorized payment to him, shall be paid to him out of any money available for the payment of salaries of employees of the Department of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, into the civil-service retirement and disability fund provided for in the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, such sum of $214.44 which shall be credited to the individual account of the said George A. Kirchberger who shall, for the purposes of such act, as amended, be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States during the period of his employment by the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIO GENERAZZO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 681) for the relief of Mario Generazzo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mario Generazzo, Revere, Mass., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, pain, and suffering of his son, George Generazzo, aged 5, who was injured as a result of being struck by a United States Army Red Cross ambulance on a public highway in the city of Revere, Mass., on October 18, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", strike out the bill down to the colon in line 1, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "to the legal guardian of George Generazzo, Revere, Mass., the sum of $750, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and pain and suffering sustained by the said George Generazzo as a result of his having been struck by a United States Army ambulance on a public highway in Revere, Mass., on October 18, 1943."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of George Generazzo."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL ENGINEERING & DRY DOCK CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 709) for the relief of the General Engineering & Dry Dock Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Navy Department be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to receive, consider, and pay the claims of the General Engineering & Dry Dock Corp. arising under Navy Department, Bureau of Ships contract NObs-10790 by reason of claimant's failure to comply with the provisions of article 5 (b) of said contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive, and insert the following: "That the Navy Department be, and is hereby, authorized to waive compliance by the General Engineer-

ing & Dry Dock Corp. with the requirement of article 5 (b) of Navy Department, Bureau of Ships Contract NObs-10790, that estimates of the cost of performing change orders be submitted within 10 days of the receipt of such orders or within such further time as the naval inspector may allow in writing within said 10-day period."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MRS. MINERVA C. DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 738) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

MEXICAN FIBRE & TWINE CO., INC.,

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1116) for the relief of Mexican Fibre & Twine Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mexican Fibre & Twine Co., Inc., San Antonio, Tex., the sum of $435.20, in full settlement of all claims against the United States representing overcharge of customs duties on sisal twine on entry No. 115 of July 25, 1946, made at New Orleans, La., resulting from certain mathematical errors in the liquidation of the entry.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 11, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOLPHUS M. HOLMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1121) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman.

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

HEIRS OF IDA LONDINSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1276) for the relief of the heirs of Ida Londinsky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to the heirs of Ida Londinsky, who was killed as a result of being struck by a Government-owned truck of the United States Army in New York City, N. Y., on November 18, 1942. The payment of this sum will be in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,000."

Page 1, after line 11, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AL W. HOSINSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2249) for the relief of Al W. Hosinski.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

JOEL W. ATKINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2353) for the relief of Joel W. Atkinson.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2922) for the relief of the State Compensation Insurance Fund of California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the State compensation insurance fund of California the sum of $478.13. Such sum represents the total amount paid by the said State Compensation Insurance Fund of California, as follows:

(1) To Allen D. Cameron, California, and Earle P. Schouten, California, for compensation and medical treatment on account of injuries sustained on February 3, 1939, when the automobile in which they were riding was in collision on the State highway near Vacaville, Calif., with a truck operated in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps. At the time of such accident, the said Allen D. Cameron and Earle P. Schouten were employees of the San Rafael Military Academy, San Rafael, Calif., and the sum of $382.10 was paid to them by the said State Compensation Insurance Fund under its workmen's compensation insurance policy with the said San Rafael Military Academy;

(2) To Officer Everett Ingram of the California Highway Patrol, for compensation and medical treatment on account of injuries sustained on August 25, 1941, when the motorcycle on which he was riding was in collision on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, with a truck operated in the service of the United States Army, and the sum of $81.78 was paid to him by the said State compensation insurance fund under its workmen's compensation insurance policy; and

(3) To the State department of motor vehicles for damage to the motorcycle on which Officer Ingram was riding, the sum of $14.25: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO ISSUE DUPLICATES OF WILLIAM GERARD'S SCRIPT CERTIFICATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2853) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicates of William Gerard's script certificates No. 2, subdivisions 11 and 12, to Blanche H. Weedon and Mattie Ward H. Harris, jointly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue to Blanche H. Weedon and Mattie Ward H. Harris, jointly, duplicates of William Gerard's special certificate No. 2, subdivision No. 11 and subdivision No. 12, each originally issued for 40 acres of public land pursuant to the act of Congress approved February 10, 1855, upon satisfactory proof of ownership and loss of same and the execution of a bond with good and sufficient securities, in double the market value of the certificates so to be issued, to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, conditioned to indemnify the United States against the presentation by an innocent holder of the alleged lost certificates. Such duplicates shall have all the legal force and effect of the original.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicates of William Gerard's script certificates No. 2, subdivisions 11 and 12, to Blanche H. Weedon and Amos L. Harris, as trustees."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Mattie Ward H. Harris, jointly" and insert in lieu thereof "Amos L. Harris, as trustees,"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicates of William Gerard's script certificates No. 2, subdivisions 11 and 12, to Blanche H. Weedon and Amos L. Harris, as trustees."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BANK OF KODIAK, KODIAK, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 580) for the relief of the Bank of Kodiak, Kodiak, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Bank of Kodiak, Kodiak, Alaska, the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement in the loss of mutilated currency of the United States aboard the steamship Yukon on February 4, 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 634) to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Henry W. Brooks, Warren, Vt., $360; to T. N. Carlton, Rural Free Delivery No. 1, Wauchula, Fla., $250; to Melvin B. Clark, Mankato, Minn., $32; to Paul A. Davis, Rural Free Delivery No. 3, Sylvan Hills, North Little Rock, Ark., $255; to Albert E. Drecoll, Libertyville, Ill., $63.25; to E. H. Ferguson, Rantoul, Ill., $64.68; to Harold L. Gavan, 229 Anderson Street, Hackensack, N. J., $24.79; to Francis E. Geagan, Hotel Vereen, Miami, Fla., $50; to John F. Gibbons, Jr., 1507 Robert Street, New Orleans, La., $155.30; to John J. Kutch, 7212 Harrow Street, Forest Hills, Long Island, N. Y., $34.57; to Mrs. Blanche Lebwith, Wyandanch, N. Y., $189.50; to Joaquin Quinones Lopez, Santurce, Puerto Rico, $600; to Mason D. Nesmith, Georgetown, S. C., $40.64; to Isadore Rosinsky, 1820 North Fifty-fourth Street, Omaha, Nebr., $706.50; to A. M. Smith, Rural Free Delivery No. 2, Columbia, S. C., $440; to Mrs. May V. Walsh, Montezuma, Ga., $35; to Herbert Grillmaier, care of Hermann Reitboeck, Clay Products Co., Panama, Republic of Panama, $190.31; and to Peter L. Feller, 125 West Sixteenth Street, New York, N. Y., $227. The payment of said sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the above-named claimants against the United States for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury caused by military personnel or civilian employees of the Army, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Army, and determined by the Department of the Army to be meritorious, which are not payable either under the provisions of the Act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223b), entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army", as amended, or under the "Federal Tort Claims Act," as codified by the act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 983; 28 U. S. C. 2672): *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RACHEL D. GATTEGNO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 633), for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rachel D. Gattegno, of Salonika, Greece, the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of her husband, David Gattegno, who died on or about July 5, 1944, as the result of a wound caused by a rifle bullet accidentally fired by a guard at a United States Army military camp at Fedhala, French Morocco, on or about July 4, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN I. MALARIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 594) for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed-credit account.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif, post office, the sum of $916.78, the amount refunded to the United States by the said John I. Malarin as a result of a deficiency that developed during February 1943 in his fixed-credit account while he was Army mail clerk at APO 932: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in the act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWIN B. ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 592) for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Edwin B. Anderson, a city letter carrier in the post office at Newton, Iowa, is hereby relieved of all liability to make refund to the United States of any amount received by him as a result of overpayment of salary from May 1, 1945, the date he was promoted from substitute postal employee to the position of regular city letter carrier by the postmaster at Newton, Iowa, to October 16, 1946, the effective date of his promotion to regular city letter carrier as authorized by the Post Office Department.

Any amount heretofore refunded to the United States by Edwin B. Anderson, or by any other person or persons on account of such overpayment of salary to Edwin B. Anderson, shall be refunded to him, or to such other person or persons, out of any money available for the payment of salaries to city-delivery carriers. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any postmaster or other designated disbursing officer of the Post Office Department or postal service, the salary payments to Edwin B. Anderson from May 1, 1945, to October 16, 1946, for service as regular city letter carrier shall be considered to have been authorized: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE BABACE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 26) for the relief of Jose Babace.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN BASQUE ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 27) for the relief of certain Basque aliens.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

RICHARD KIM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 90) to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization

laws Richard Kim, who served as a member of the armed forces of the United States, shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon the payment of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8. The Secretary of State is directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that said quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for permanent residence status of Richard Kim."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHUNG KWAI LUI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 315) for the relief of Doctor Chung Kwai Lui.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Dr. Chung Kwai Lui as having entered the United States in 1936 for permanent residence, upon the payment by her of the visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued, and to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced, in the case of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui. The Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Chinese quota for the first year that a quota number is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARIS U. YEADON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 335) for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the Unted States for permanent residence and relating to admissions at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, that provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (c)), which excludes from admission into the United States "persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude," shall not hereafter be held to apply to Claris U. Yeadon (nee Claris U. Davis), the wife of Cecil S. Yeadon, an American citizen. If she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, an immigration visa may be issued and admission granted to the said Claris U. Yeadon under this act upon application hereafter filed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIE E. WRIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2231) for the relief of Marie E. Wright.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marie E. Wright, of Gibson, N. C., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of injuries to person and property and future medical expenses sustained by her when the United States Army vehicle in which she was a passenger was struck by another United States Army vehicle at Berlin, Germany, on March 19, 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$4,528.83."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EWA PLANTATION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2233) for the relief of Ewa Plantation Co., a Hawaiian corporation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $120,631.27 to Ewa Plantation Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, in full settlement of all claims listed herein against the United States for property damages caused by aircraft, gunfire, flares, and other acts of the armed forces of the United States from December 8, 1941, through June 20, 1945, upon lands held under lease by said company, resulting in the damage to or the destruction of the crops of sugarcane belonging to said company upon its lands adjacent to Pearl Harbor on the Island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii.

Claim No.	Date	Field No.	Amount
1	Dec. 8, 1941	61	$17,571.03
2	May 21, 1944	69, 72, and 64	7,965.12
3	June 12, 1945	47	21,403.06
4	June 20, 1945	81.2	3,326.35
5	Feb. 15, 1942	55	118.09
6	Mar. 8, 1942	75	5,599.19
7	Apr. 7, 1942	69	5,251.61
8	Jan. 30, 1943	67	1,792.23
9	Feb. 19, 1943	2.2	672.34
10	Mar. 6, 1943	74.1	78.57
11	Mar. 25, 1943	27	87.68
12	Apr. 6, 1943	1	7,746.48
13	May 26, 1943	20.1	607.68
14	June 10, 1943	71	3,392.79
15	June 19, 1943	45	625.25
16	Sept. 5, 1943	61	7,621.74
17	Nov. 29, 1943	12	655.57
18	Jan. 1, 1944	43.1	13,036.17
19	Apr. 15, 1944	1	52.09
20	July 29, 1944	76	32.24
20-A	Aug. 6, 1944	72	495.41
22	Sept. 2, 1944	67.1	542.01
23	Sept. 14, 1944	66.1	2,686.59
24	Nov. 21, 1944	67.1	8,425.50
25	Dec. 18, 1944	18	8,583.27
26	Jan. 15, 1945	27	109.74
27	Feb. 17, 1945	27	85.51
28	Mar. 6, 1945	63.1	Nil
29	Mar. 6, 1945	53	1,067.96
Total			120,631.27

Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection therewith, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JULIA BALINT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 679) to authorize the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WALTER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. I object to the consideration of the bill, Mr. Speaker; I should like to know something about it.

The SPEAKER. One objection is not sufficient.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the quota limitations now provided by law, a quota immigration visa may be issued to Julia Balint, provided she is otherwise admissible to the United States under the immigration laws, upon payment of the visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the issuance of the visa, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the first available quota for Czechoslovakia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MAY K. Y. MOK, FREDERICK W. S. MOK, AND VINCENT W. C. MOK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1010) for the relief of Mrs. May K. Y. Mok, Frederick W. S. Mok, and Vincent W. C. Mok.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, in the case of aliens Mrs. May K. Y. Mok and her two minor sons, Frederick W. S. Mok and Vincent W. C. Mok, all of Berkeley, Calif., and is directed not to issue hereafter any such warrants or orders in the case of such aliens. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Mrs. May K. Y. Mok, the said Frederick W. S. Mok, and the said Vincent W. C. Mok, who entered the United States on September 21, 1945, for a temporary stay, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, as of such date, to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the aliens Mrs. May K. Y. Mok and

her two minor sons, Frederick W. S. Mok and Vincent W. C. Mok, shall be considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on September 21, 1945, the date of their actual entry into the United States, upon payment by them of visa fees and head tax.

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the Chinese racial quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRAM B. TELLEKAMP

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1591) for the relief of Bram B. Tellekamp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Bram B. Tellekamp, of Honolulu, T. H., shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on March 17, 1947, the date of his actual entry into the Territory of Hawaii, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Netherlands for the first year that said quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "March 17, 1947" and insert "March 18, 1947."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RALPH MARTIN ELZINGRE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1876) for the relief of Ralph Martin Elzingre, also known as Ralph Seawell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Ralph Martin Elzingre, also known as Ralph Seawell, of Mill Valley, Marin County, Calif., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted at San Pedro, Calif., on May 2, 1945, to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 8, page 1, substitute a comma for the period and add the following: "upon payment of the visa fee and head tax.

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall authorize the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of the Philippine Islands."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RALEIGH B. DIAMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1791) for the relief of Raleigh B. Diamond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Raleigh B. Diamond, of Jacksonville, Fla., the sum of $6,539.10, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained on February 6, 1944, while riding in a jeep attached to the naval mine-warfare test station, Solomons, Md.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES FLYNN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 731) for the relief of James Flynn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James Flynn, Clinton, Mass., the sum of $3,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said James Flynn against the United States on account of personal injuries received by him on December 9, 1945, as a result of an accident in which a motor vehicle of the United States post office, Pawtucket, R. I., was involved at Hamilton Square, Clinton, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HARRY E. HEWITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 682) for the relief of Mrs. Harry E. Hewitt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Harry E. Hewitt, of Peabody, Mass., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries incurred by her minor son Elliott Hewitt, and for medical and hospital expenses resulting therefrom, as a result of being burned from a fire carelessly and negligently left unguarded by employees of the Works Progress Administration in February 1938, on sidewalk project on Lynn Street, Peabody, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Mrs. Harry E. Hewitt" and insert "the legal guardian of Elliott Hewitt."

Line 7, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,500."

Line 9, strike out "her minor son" and insert "the said."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "1938" and insert "1940."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Elliott Hewitt."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARVEY M. LIFSET

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 607) for the relief of Harvey M. Lifset, formerly a major in the Army of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Harvey M. Lifset, formerly a major in the Army of the United States, is relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of $1,497.89. Such sum represents Government funds stolen from him in France while he was acting as purchasing and contracting officer for the Eighty-second Airborne Division, United States Army. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts which have been paid by the said Harvey M. Lifset in partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States arising by reason of such theft.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRITZ BUSCHE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 602) for the relief of Fritz Busche.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed (1) to revoke vesting orders No. 7550, executed September 5, 1946 (11 F. R. 11092); 7561, executed September 5, 1946 (11 F. R. 11143); 7658, executed September 18, 1946 (11 F. R. 13444); and 8085, executed January 24, 1947 (12 F. R. 879); and (2) in the performance of his functions under Executive

Order 9788, issued October 14, 1946, to make no further claim against the property covered by such vesting orders. Such property is the property of Fritz Busche, a citizen of the United States and veteran of World War II, as a result of gifts made to him by certain relatives of German nationality prior to the declaration of war by the United States against Germany on December 11, 1941.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAMPTON INSTITUTE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 593) for the relief of Hampton Institute.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Hampton Institute, of Hampton, Va., a private, nonprofit, educational institution, is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the balance, due on and after April 1, 1948, of the purchase price of certain property purchased from the United States by Hampton Institute pursuant to Supplement No. 6, dated December 1, 1945, of contract No. NOd 3041, dated August 5, 1942, between the United States of America and Hampton Institute. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hampton Institute an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts due and payable on and after April 1, 1948, under such contract, as supplemented, which have been paid by Hampton Institute to the United States. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to transfer to Hampton Institute all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property purchased under such contract, as supplemented.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTOR R. BROWNING & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 599) for the relief of Victor R. Browning & Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,100, to Victor R. Browning & Co., Inc., of Willoughby, Ohio, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States under contract No. NOY–13693, dated , entered into by Victor R. Browning & Co., Inc., with the United States Government through the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department, contracting for and providing for the construction of crane equipment for delivery to the Navy Yard at Charleston, S. C.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PHIL H. HUBBARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 735) for the relief of Phil H. Hubbard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Phil H. Hubbard, American consulate, Birmingham, England, the sum of $939.25. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Phil H. Hubbard against the United States for reimbursement of the expenses incident to the transportation, during June 1945, of his wife and children from the United States to Zurich, Switzerland, where he was stationed as American consul. Although such expenses would normally have been paid by the Department of State, the said Phil H. Hubbard was required to pay such expenses because of lack of funds available to the Department of State for such purpose: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN F. GALVIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 766) for the relief of John F. Galvin.

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LICHTENWALTER]?

There was no objection.

MRS. REBECCA LEVY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3077) for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Rebecca Levy, of Seattle, Wash., the sum of $6,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Rebecca Levy against the United States arising out of the death of her husband, Isaac Levy, which resulted from his being struck by a United States Army vehicle in Seattle, Wash., on September 26, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESSE A. LOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3234) for the relief of Jesse A. Lott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., and Supp. V, title 5, secs. 765–770, inclusive), the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Federal Security Agency is hereby authorized and directed to consider any claim filed with the Bureau by Jesse A. Lott for compensation under such act, within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, on account of alleged injuries incurred at the United States Maritime Shipyard, Brunswick, Ga., on or about May 16, 1918. No benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IVA GAVIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3254) for the relief of Iva Gavin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Iva Gavin, of Muncie, Ind., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings suffered and incurred by her when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by an Army Air Corps bus at or near Dayton, Ohio, on August 18, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA MALONE AND RITA ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1101) for the relief of Anna Malone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 19 (a) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889–890; 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155), the Attorney General is authorized and directed to permit Anna Malone, of San Luis Obispo, Calif., to remain permanently in the United States if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than quotas.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all of page 1 and insert: "That the Attorney General is hereby directed to cancel the warrant of arrest, warrant of deportation, and any outstanding

bond or bonds in connection with existing deportation proceedings against Anna Malone and Rita Anderson, both of San Luis Obispo, Calif., because of violations of section 19 (a) of the Immigration Act of February 1917 (30 Stat. 889–890; 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155). The Attorney General is likewise directed not to issue any further such warrants of arrest or warrants of deportation against the said Anna Malone and Rita Anderson because of the conduct upon which the present proceedings are founded."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Anna Malone and Rita Anderson."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUSSIAN ORTHODOX GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH OF NORTH AMERICA, SOUTH NAKNEK, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2812) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land at South Naknek to the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the filing of an application and the payment of $10 within 1 year from the date of this act by the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania, the Secretary of the Interior shall issue a patent to said corporation for a tract of land at South Naknek near South Naknek village on the south side Naknek River, Bristol Bay area, Alaska, described as follows:

Beginning at corner No. 1 of United States survey 2875; thence east one hundred and one and four-tenths feet to corner No. 4 of United States survey 2875 on the west boundary of United States survey 1581; thence south one hundred and ninety feet along west boundary of United States survey 1581 to a point from which corner No. 1 of United States survey 1581 bears south one hundred and eighty and fifty-seven one-hundredths feet; then west one hundred and forty feet; thence north one hundred and ninety feet; thence east thirty-eight and six-tenths feet to the point of beginning, containing sixty-one one-hundredths acre.

SEC. 2. The patent issued under this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits in said lands and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 15, after the word "under", insert the words "applicable laws and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 29]

Barden	Hoffman, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Blatnik	Howell	Smith, Ohio
Bulwinkle	Jenison	Smith, Wis.
Celler	Karst	Somers
Chiperfield	Latham	Tackett
Cox	Lesinski	Taylor
Crosser	Lucas	Teague
Dawson	Norrell	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	O'Konski	Trimble
Ellsworth	Plumley	Wadsworth
Fulton	Poulson	Whitaker
Gathings	Reed, N. Y.	White, Idaho
Gilmer	Sadowski	Wood
Harris	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Woodhouse
Hays, Ark.		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 387 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HOUSING AND RENT CONTROL, 1949

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1731, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Friday the Clerk had read through section 203 of the committee substitute.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Kansas: On page 34 strike out lines 23 to 25, inclusive, and on page 35 strike out lines 1 to 18, inclusive.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer today new bait. This is more palatable bait than has heretofore been offered. As a matter of fact, it is the type of bait that members of both parties are more interested in than that which was offered before. This bait is such that it will permit you to understand what we are attempting to do in writing a new bill. The amendment which I offer today is one of a series of amendments. This amendment together with the other amendments will be offered clause by clause, phrase by phrase, section by section, to turn the bill as it has been introduced to present law.

Thus I hope to underscore what is happening to you in the so-called tightening of rent control.

The particular amendment which I have proposed today provides for striking out the right of the Expediter to recontrol those areas which have been heretofore or may hereafter be decontrolled in any defense rental area, notwithstanding any administrative decontrol action taken since June 30, 1947, except of course that he may not recontrol areas which have been decontrolled by the emergency court of appeal.

I see no reason to permit the Housing Expediter to recontrol areas which he has decontrolled. When the Housing Expediter appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency in support of this provision, he said the reason for it was a possible need to establish control in a defense area, which might arise after it had been decontrolled. That was one reason.

Secondly, he said that conditions might change in any decontrolled area, that the supply of rental housing might become inadequate. He said under well-defined limitations he would recontrol those areas.

I have attempted to find the well-defined limitations or restrictions under which we have placed the Expediter in the event he would attempt to recontrol any area.

Going back to the original OPA law, I read from section 2 (b), that the Housing Expediter, or the Administrator at that time, may take such action as is necessary and proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act. He may issue a declaration setting forth the necessity for and recommendation with reference to the stabilization or reduction of houses in any defense-rental area.

Mr. Chairman, that is the so-called well-defined limitation under which the Housing Expediter may desire to recontrol areas which have been decontrolled. In his judgment any necessity for recontrolling may be sufficient, and, in my opinion, that is it.

It has been said, and later was produced in the hearings before the committee, that this provision will give the Expediter a more lenient method of decontrolling. If he makes a mistake he may recontrol. But I point out again that the reasons that the Housing Expediter may desire to recontrol are economic conditions which may change, not emergency conditions, but economic conditions which may change, as the gentleman from Missouri said the other day. Conditions may change so that we find ourselves in a depression period so that the people of this country will not have adequate means to find satisfactory rental. If these conditions arise, then the Housing Expediter, in my judgment, under this provision, would be entitled to recontrol areas which heretofore have been decontrolled. Therefore, as we are facing a possible change in our economic situation, I suggest that we do not permit the Housing Expediter this additional authority to recontrol areas which have been heretofore decontrolled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a new provision in rent-control legislation; it has never been in a bill; it has never been in the law. The committee has always opposed it; we opposed it on the theory that we

did not want the Housing Expediter to have that much power, but this time I believe the committee while it is not unanimously for it, I believe a large majority of the Members are for this provision. The reasons are obvious: A lot of areas and portions of areas are on the fringe. The Housing Expediter is not willing to take the responsibility of removing an area or portion of an area entirely, although it looks like it is ripe to be taken off, for the reason that he had experience along that line that taught him that in some instances the people would take advantage of it and run the rents up not just 10 percent, but 50 percent, 100 percent, 500 percent.

This provision is to encourage the Expediter to run a risk, to go ahead and take it off; then if they do not act right he has the power under this law to recontrol. Therefore, you are encouraged and you have an incentive to remove just as many just as quickly and just as fast as possible. I think it is the finest thing in the bill in the direction of decontrol, and certainly we do not want to take it out.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. As I understand, originally about 660 areas were under control; at the present time 598 areas are under control.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Would the gentleman care to state what the experience was according to the testimony before the committee, in those areas which were decontrolled?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman knows more about that than I, but I know that the experience of the Expediter was not always a happy one; after he decontrolled an area he could not put it back, and the people could just do nothing they wanted to in trying to establish a limit as to rent; it has been rather unfortunate. I wish the gentleman would get 5 minutes' time and go into this subject as soon as my time is up; I think it would be a fine thing.

So this provision should be in this bill, this recontrol provision; if you want to encourage the Expediter to decontrol you should give him power to recontrol in the event there are abuses. Furthermore, it is notice to the people who own houses in these areas or portions of areas that they must not get unreasonable if they do not want the Housing Expediter to come back in and take action. It will caution them and cause them to be more discreet in their handling of the tenants. And remember that the power here is not just to remove a defense area; the Housing Expediter may remove a portion of that area. Suppose there are 10 counties in the area; he may remove 1 county, 2 counties, or the whole area of 10 counties; so, in that event, he is encouraged to decontrol the whole area or any portion of it. And, too, there is a restriction: If the Emergency Court of Appeals has held that an area to be decontrolled—which they have held in cases including the gentleman's city in Florida—it would be impossible for the Housing Expediter to recontrol it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. If the local rent control board recommends decontrol, does the language carried in the bill, the provision the gentleman wants retained in this bill, give the Expediter the power to recontrol it even though the local board has recommended decontrol?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; the gentleman means if they had recommended decontrol, and if it had been decontrolled that the Housing Expediter under the present law has the power to put it back under control in the event it were necessary. But if the local board made a recommendation and it was not accepted by the Housing Expediter, but they appealed to the Emergency Court of Appeals and the Emergency Court of Appeals said it should be controlled; then, under this amendment the Housing Expediter cannot touch that area in any way in the world; it remains decontrolled.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, continuing the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] one step further, I hold in my hand here a weekly magazine issued out of the State of North Carolina. I am impressed with this very shocking statement on the enormous rise in the rent ceilings in the Greensboro, N. C., area. As the gentleman from Texas indicated, the Expediter has the right to decontrol a portion of an area. That is what took place in this particular area of Greensboro, N. C. A portion of the area was decontrolled and within a very brief period of time the rent in this decontrol area increased over 100 percent. I read from this news item:

> Rent ceilings were taken off 14 dwelling units in Greensboro in the 3 months ended January 31, 1949. The area rent director said Friday the rapidity with which these rents have shot up following decontrol has been a shock to us. Rents climbed to a total of $776 a month compared to the previous ceiling of $426. The average rise was 105 percent above the previous ceiling. It was a part of a Nation-wide study ordered by the Housing Expediter.

Mr. Chairman, it does appear to me that the recontrol provision in the bill is a very timely provision. Not only would it tend to stabilize rents in these rental defense areas but, as the gentleman from Texas indicated, it would enable the Expediter to decontrol many fringe areas with the reasonable belief that this Greensboro situation would not arise.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand the law now, once an area is decontrolled the Expediter has no authority to recontrol it no matter how high they go with their rents, is that correct?

Mr. DEANE. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a result of that, there is a natural hesitancy to decontrol some areas. This particular provision would be as important in connection with the desire to have as many areas decontrolled as possible, which the Expediter will do; then if there is an unreasonable, abnormal increase or an abuse under decontrol he could recontrol under those circumstances?

Mr. DEANE. Would the gentleman feel that this rise of 105 percent in this Greensboro area is reasonable or unreasonable?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, well, my impression of that would be that under the circumstances it is unreasonable. I say this provision here is a provision for more efficient operation of the law and for more satisfaction being meted out, is that correct?

Mr. DEANE. That is correct.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In other words, your committee by the use of this language means to arm the Expediter with a loaded gun with which to bully and browbeat property owners?

Mr. DEANE. No, I cannot agree with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, because, in my opinion, the Expediter has been trying to carry on a job under legislation which has been practically impossible to administer.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is it not a fact that since April 1, 1948, under local area rent boards that have the power to make recommendations for decontrol they have only made 14 such recommendations, and is it not a fact further that those who are in touch with the situation locally are in a better position to make these recommendations?

Mr. DEANE. I do, and may I make this further observation: In my own Congressional district I asked for two surveys to be made by the Expediter. These surveys were made and the leading officials of these communities reported there was need for a continuation of controls. I contend these local boards are in the best position to know the needs of the local communities.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Is it not a fact that if this is allowed to remain as it is, giving the Expediter the power to recontrol, it really means there will be an acceleration to decontrol?

Mr. DEANE. Yes.

Mr. SPENCE. And that was the reason the committee adopted it; because they thought of many instances, where he might decontrol them, he would be armed with power to recontrol if they did not violate the duty that the landlord owed the tenant or the tenant the landlord, and that was the very purpose of it, to accelerate decontrol.

Mr. DEANE. Indeed, it was.

Mr. SPENCE. That was the reason we adopted it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, those of you who may have some feeling that giving this right to the Expediter is giving him a loaded gun should have their attention directed to the fact that the local boards may still make recommendations, and if the Expediter does not go along with the local board, the local board can still take the matter to the Emergency Court of Appeals and have any mistakes of the Expediter rectified. In other words, the law now provides that if your local board, your local people, think that your area should get an increase in rent or should be decontrolled entirely, they make that recommendation. If the Expediter does not go along with it, you take it to the Emergency Court of Appeals and the Emergency Court of Appeals will do the right thing for you. If the Expediter should now go back and recontrol an area which has been previously decontrolled and, bear in mind, if the court has decontrolled it, the Expediter can do nothing about it—it permits decontrol permanently. But, if those areas where a local board should make recommendation and the Expediter does not go along with it, or he should recontrol it and the local board differs with him, the board can go to court and get it decontrolled if the facts require it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understood the majority leader to say that where the decontrol had been recommended by the Expediter, that he could not then go back and recontrol. But I understand, in the bill, he can, unless the Emergency Court of Appeals has ruled upon the question. The Expediter may have decontrolled an area, but under this bill he can go back and recontrol that area; is that correct?

Mr. MULTER. There are two methods now for decontrol; one by the Expediter and the other by the Emergency Court of Appeals if the Expediter did not want to do it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the Expediter has decontrolled an area and the Emergency Court of Appeals has not acted upon it, can he go back and recontrol that area?

Mr. MULTER. He may recontrol that area, subject, again, to court review, as I have already indicated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am inclined to think my friend misunderstood what I did say. I said under existing law, once he decontrolled as I understand, no matter how high the rents were, he could not recontrol it.

Mr. MULTER. Under existing law he cannot do anything about it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Under the proposed law he can?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Under the proposed law, though, there is no appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals if the Housing Expediter recontrols an area which has been decontrolled.

Mr. MULTER. I do not agree with the gentleman because the local board, despite the recontrol by the Expediter, the local board can make the recommendation to decontrol thereafter and if he does not go along with it——

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Yes; thereafter.

Mr. MULTER. We are talking about changing circumstances. If an area is now decontrolled, we are not going to recontrol it unless the rents go sky high and the tenants have no place to go. If the local board recommends decontrol and the Expediter disagrees, you go to court and get it decontrolled.

I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, last week when we had this matter up for discussion our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], read a statement from the newspaper which indicated that about 100 sections or districts of the country have been agreed upon to be decontrolled. Later I saw several references to the same effect in the newspaper. I wonder if anyone has come forward with a list of those 100, or whatever number they were, because I would like to know what districts have been agreed upon.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in answer to the gentleman's question I shall say this, that the list which he has referred to is a list of so-called fringe areas. It is not an official statement from the Housing Expediter's office to the effect that these areas would be decontrolled. It is merely a list of some number of areas that are considered fringe communities in some 26 States. It was not offered as bait. It was not offered in any manner to bring in votes to support this legislation. That has been known to the members of the committee for some time.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not yield further. The gentleman declines to furnish that information.

This statement said positively that a certain Member of this House had appeared before the newsmen and had put out that statement. This is what I want to know. I want to know what was said and what sections were thereby favored. I come from a district that has some fair sized city areas and some rural areas. I have appeared on the floor of this House repeatedly, when this rent matter was formerly up before us for consideration and tried to effect some decontrols. As I remember it I offered an amendment 2 or 3 years ago that I think was adopted. That amendment provided that the Expediter or the man in national authority at that time could decontrol the rural sections, if it was evident that rent control was not necessary. It never has been done in my section. I had one of the top men from the Washington office come to my office in my home city. I asked the Washington office to send with him a man with practical experience. This man with practical experience recommended decontrol, but the Washington man failed to follow his advice. If any secret agreements have been made as a bait or in any other way and done quietly, and done in favor of somebody, I want to know who did it and who profits by it. If somebody does not come forward with that information, then I say we ought to have an investigation. I want to know right now if the information can be given. If it cannot be given, someone surely can give us some information. I do not want any of this fringy business. Let us have "Yes" or "No."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not want to mention any names, and I am not going to, but I do know that that list has been circulated among numerous Members of the House. They know what is in it. I cannot for the life of me see why it is so confidential that every Member of the House should not be entitled to see it. We raised that question the other day. As far as I know it is yet a confidential list available only to a select few. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may say that that does not constitute bait. I say that it does constitute bait. There is no reason why I should not see that list or the gentleman from Ohio should not see it or any Member of the House should not see it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. No.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does not the gentleman want information on this? He is asking for information.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not want the kind of information the gentleman gave last week when he talked a lot about this but furnished no information.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In other words, the gentleman is not interested in the facts.

Mr. JENKINS. I have the floor and I decline to yield. I repeat, I do not want any of this fringy business. I do not want information such as the gentleman gave last week, which was evasive and was in no way responsive or satisfactory. The gentleman evidently has the information and evidence; then why does he not produce it? If some sections been promised relief in such a way as that those who know about it refuse to give out the information, then I repeat that we should call for an investigation.

Mr. Chairman, apparently there is no one who will offer to clarify this situation. I shall keep this questioning up until we get some information.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE of Kansas) there were—ayes 86, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS: On page 35, line 18, strike out the quotation marks, and after line 18, insert the following subsection:

"(j) If the legislature or comparable governing body of any State, municipality,

county, or other political subdivision declares by resolution that Federal rent control is no longer needed in such State, municipality, county, or political subdivision, and transmits a certified copy of such resolution to the Housing Expediter, the provisions of this title shall be inaplicable to such State, municipality, county, or political subdivision 15 days after such certified copy shall have been mailed by registered mail to the Housing Expediter."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those who say that there is no need to have Federal rent control in certain areas of our country, nor am I one of those who believe that this should be a local proposition, locally enforced and locally instigated. I am a firm believer, of course, in maintaining the right of the States to order and control their own affairs; but the critical housing crisis which faces the country today was brought on by a war and a national emergency. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I favor granting to local authorities the right to decontrol in sections where decontrol is necessary and advisable. Certainly no one knows better than the elected local officials of any town, county, or legislature of any State whether rent control is needed within the area under their jurisdiction.

The adoption of this amendment, of course, will give some semblance of local control over rents. In areas where it is not needed, this amendment makes it mandatory that the Housing Expediter decontrol those areas upon receipt of a resolution duly passed by the duly elected officials of those areas.

This is in keeping with the division of powers under our Constitution between the States and the Federal Government. It is in keeping with the needs of our people by recognizing that those who are confronted with the situation know best how to take care of that situation themselves.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. COX. I am very strongly in favor of the gentleman's amendment, and yet I think I realize that the adoption of his amendment is not going to make this rent-control law a good law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think so, either.

Mr. COX. Because you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. However, the amendment ought to be adopted. The adoption of it would make the measure less sweeping in its operation. I believe the House, when it finally comes to vote upon the measure as amended, should vote it down.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will give the Federal Government the right to determine whether they are going to recognize the right and competence of local officials to govern their own affairs. By passing this amendment you will say that these people who are on the ground, these people who live in the cities, the States, and the counties know more about taking care of their own affairs than some appointed bureaucrat sitting behind a desk in Washington. You will recognize the dignity of the individual community. You will recognize the dignity of the county, the dignity of the State, the dignity of the municipality.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment would be destructive of the very purposes of the bill. We have adopted rent control because of a national emergency, and that is the ground upon which the courts have upheld it, including the Supreme Court of the United States.

There must be a national pattern if we are going to subserve the purposes for which rent control was adopted. That pattern would be utterly destroyed by the adoption of this amendment.

There is a principle in law by which you may classify property for taxation and for regulation, but the classification must be reasonable, and all persons similarly situated must be treated substantially the same. That ought to apply to rent control. Where do you place the power to decontrol property in this amendment? You give it to the legislatures of the States. You give it to the county commissioners of the counties and to the board of councilmen or the commissioners of a city affected. Of course, they will be under pressure all the time to decontrol, and, of course, the powerful interests are the landed interests. It would result in confusion worse confounded. It would gut the bill and destroy the purposes for which it was originally enacted.

I have great respect for the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who offered this amendment. He was a distinguished soldier, and he deserves the consideration of this House, but I think his amendment would be destructive of everything we are trying to accomplish.

Suppose a city governing board refused to decontrol. Then they would apply to the county governing board. If the county governing board refused to decontrol, they would take it to the State legislature. It does not involve local self-government. We have to give up some of our rights when a national emergency exists. Primitive man was the only man who was absolutely free. When he entered organized society he gave up some of his rights for the general good.

Then I hear a lot of talk about the invasion of the Constitution, and crocodile tears are being shed over our lost liberties. The founders of our Government made but one constitutional court, the Supreme Court of the United States. The great Chief Justice, John Marshall, said that that Court would decide whether an act was constitutional or not. That Court ever since has held that jurisdiction. They used it in this case, and they said that rent control was constitutional, and that a national emergency existed. That is the reason it is on the statute books today.

If you do not want rent control, I hope you will vote against it and make the issue clear so the responsibility of its destruction, if that should happen, will be placed where it belongs.

I am tired of seeing perfecting amendments to destroy the bill. I know that this was introduced in all sincerity, but that is the effect it would have, and that is the effect most of these amendments would have: Utterly to destroy the bill and to destroy every purpose upon which it was enacted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the gentleman from Kentucky saying that he does not have faith in the judgment of his local officials?

Mr. SPENCE. I have not faith that the local people will keep the pattern of national rent control; no, I have not faith that they will do that. I have faith, of course, in their discharging the duties for which they were elected; but this is something different, this is not ordinary legislation, and I do not think we ought to impose these administrative powers on the local legislative bodies generally and then say to certain sections, "You may decontrol." What will the result be? One county will be decontrolled and another county similarly situated will be controlled.

I am also wondering whether or not the Congress has the power to delegate to these legislative bodies the power to decide when a Federal law shall operate and when it shall cease to operate, bodies over which the Congress exercises no authority of selection and over whose action it has no control.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not attempt to engage in a constitutional battle with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], but it does occur to me that somewhere in the Constitution it is stated that all powers not given to the Congress are reserved to the States and to the people. Let us bring rent control into that pattern.

The argument which has been advanced by the gentleman from Kentucky brings to light the sorry thing that is involved in rent control; it is the suggestion that now, almost 4 years after the war is over, we should attempt to force into a national pattern, as he describes it, areas where the people best in position to know whether rent control is needed have no voice, to force them into that national pattern of rent control whether they believe it is needed there or not.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] said a while ago in connection with another amendment, the local people are the ones best in position to know. Why not let them have the decision?

I was impressed Friday by the argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] when he made the plea to the House that this was a problem of the big cities, and urged that the people in the rural areas or the people from the back parts of the country should give the city people a chance to have rent control,

that the rest of us should not impose our will upon them.

That was the argument of the gentleman from New York.

By the same token, the men from the cities who have this problem, who want rent control, should not attempt to say to the portions of the country which feel they do not need it, that they must have it or that they must place in the hands of some bureaucrat sitting in Washington the power to say whether or not it should be imposed upon the local areas.

I am perfectly willing for the gentleman from New York to have rent control in New York if he wants it; I am perfectly willing for some city in my district to have rent control if they want it, but by the same token, I say: Do not impose it upon the communities where the local governing authority says they do not need it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Sorry; I decline to yield.

Mr. Chairman, there are some unhappy aspects of this rent-control problem. I heard the gentlewoman from Utah the other day talk about some unit paying $7 a month in rent, which she said did not pay the taxes; and yet she was for rent control because she thought there was a need in some quarters. But I must say that in my honest opinion it is a rather sorry business we are dealing with when we say to certain segments of the people, to wit, those who happen to have their money invested in real estate, that they should be required to operate at a loss if someone in Washington says, "You must give your goods at a cost that will not even pay taxes upon it," and you do not impose that kind of rule upon the balance of the economy. The least we can do, it seems to me, is to give authority to these local communities such as is suggested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi and let the wishes of the people who know most about it control the situation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, I have some salient facts here regarding State laws so far as expiration dates are concerned.

The State of Connecticut has a State law which expires upon adjournment of the assembly. A new bill has been introduced to extend the time limit.

The State law of the State of New York expires on June 30, 1949.

The State of Virginia State law extends to July 1, 1950.

In the State of Wisconsin the State law expires on April 1, 1949.

In the State of Maryland they have enabling legislation for local governing body control which expires on June 1, 1949.

In the State of Illinois they have enabling legislation for local governing body control which expires on June 30, 1949.

In the State of New Jersey their State law has expired. A bill has been introduced to revive the authority.

In the States of Minnesota, Missouri, Louisiana, Michigan, and Rhode Island the State laws have expired.

Since April 1, 1948, when local boards were selected upon the recommendation of the governors of the respective States approved by the Housing Expediter, who are in immediate touch and have been over a period of years, who know the local rent situation, in less than 600 rent areas where there are 767 of these local boards, there have been but 14 recommendations by local boards for decontrol. In other words, the people who have been charged with the responsibility of reviewing these cases, who are familiar with the cases, who are familiar with the local rent situation in their areas, have recommended but 14 areas for decontrol.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to remind the gentleman that in the State of West Virginia we have no rent-control law. Our constitution limits the session of our legislature to 60 days. It meets on the second Wednesday of January. Our legislature has adjourned. Under this proposal we would be without rent control unless the legislature would meet again.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may say in answer to the gentleman from West Virginia that situation is similar in my own State. The members who were elected to the legislature were not elected on this particular issue. They are not in immediate touch with this particular problem, and I dare say that in almost one-half of the States of this Nation the assemblies are not in session at the present time. They have made no provision in any appropriations to take care of the local situation, and I am certain that it would lead to nothing but a chaotic rent condition if the pending amendment were adopted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. May I say to the gentleman from West Virginia that he has missed entirely the meaning of this amendment. The amendment does not decontrol. It gives the State legislature the authority to decontrol. It gives them the authority to decontrol if it is not needed. The State of West Virginia, therefore, would not be without rent control until such time as the State legislature determined there was no further need for rent control or until such time as an individual, county, or city determined there was no need for rent control within the area under their jurisdiction.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may say that what the gentleman's amendment does is that it recommends that the legislature or a comparable local government, a municipality, city, or political subdivision, if it declares by resolution that rent control is no longer needed, then the area is decontrolled.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Does not the gentleman have a much more effective provision for local control of these situations in the present law which we are continuing in this bill, to wit, the local board recommendations, which are the people in each locality who know their own situation in each district and make the recommendation?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is the entire purport of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi seeks to interject into rent control local determination for decontrol of areas. I think we owe the gentleman from Mississippi a good deal of credit for his fight made two years ago on this floor which resulted in the process which we now have which, I believe, puts local consideration of the problem directly where it belongs.

You men know that these local boards, now provided by present law, have to be nominated by the Governors of the States from that locality. They meet, and they can recommend, after due hearings, decontrol of their areas. It goes to the Housing Expediter, and if they are not satisfied with the action of the Housing Expediter then they have an automatic appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals. This is a three-judge Federal court, assigned for the specific job of handling rent control.

Now, that delegates local control in an orderly and a constitutional way because these nominees by the Governor are automatically appointed by the Housing Expediter, and the review in case of dissatisfaction of his action is appealable to a Federal court.

Let us contrast the constitutionality of that process designed to give this local consideration power in decontrol—and incidentally in hardship adjustments by these local boards—to what the amendment today does.

This provides that no one group has the responsibility, authority, or right to decontrol, but any one of a number of governmental groups, your State legislature, your county commissioners, or other municipal subdivisions of that area all are possessed of this power.

This would allow very easily the county commissioners and the city commissioners to get into a fight over which should have their way on whether the area should be decontrolled or whether it should continue under control.

The State legislature might decide that they wanted to continue control for an entire State against the wishes of the city council. It would provide stretching of Federal authority a long, long way and to give to non-Federal officers great powers under Federal law. I believe it could even pass Federal power to a board of township governors under this amendment.

I believe it is unconstitutional. The authority of Congress to vote rent con-

trol is for the reason of a national emergency which Congress finds exists. This great power to determine a national emergency cannot be carelessly handed over clear down through 10 or 12 echelons of local governing bodies, and thus say that anyone of that group can decontrol any area by resolution.

Is there any standard? Is there any consideration of the rights that these groups have? Most of my city officials in my State, and I believe most of the county commissioners, have only well-defined powers under State law, and I do not know of any powers that they have to construe or determine Federal law. If you pass this on to them they have only informal powers to meet around the table some afternoon or evening and resolve that they are going to do away with rent control in that particular area. Yet you ask that the United States Congress would without procedures, standards, or hearings pass over to local government units this sole right to make the decision for us as to whether rent controls are necessary or not.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Would it not be much better to vote against the bill entirely, to have no national rent law? Let the State legislatures of the States, or the cities, decide if they want to be under rent control and not us select them. This cannot be enforced, because you have so many jurisdictional questions.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the gentleman, and you would have this confusion of jurisdiction over who had the right to decontrol.

I think under present law we have put the local control into this thing in a legal and a constitutional way. I believe you gentlemen know that these local, self-governing bodies can appear at any time before these juries of local citizens who form these local boards, and recommend decontrol if they so desire.

One point more. There are dozens of areas under rent control that cover 5 or 10 counties, that cover 15 or 20 municipalities. When we pass this power on to the subdivisions of local government, we do not know who they will be, or who will exercise this vast grant of power, this right of determination over whether or not rent control will be continued.

I ask you to vote down the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been under the impression that the best government was that which was kept close to the people. I am wondering what we want to do here today. Do we want to put in the hands of somebody in Washington enough power that they can say to these small communities, and I have several in my district, "You cannot decontrol your area, whether you want to or not"? Are you afraid of the folks at home?

The type of argument the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from New York have made is the type of argument that leads to the totalitarian state, that the Government knows best and you must follow what the big Government in Washington tells you to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. May I say that the purpose of this amendment is to take the final authority out of the hands of an appointed bureaucrat responsible only to the person who appoints him and place it in the hands of local, elected officials, responsible to the people who will be affected by rent control?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. We must remember that these boards in the different districts are appointed with the approval of the rent director. They have to have his approval. Sure, they are recommended by the Governor, but they are not appointed unless they have the approval of the rent expediter. The county officials and city officials are elected by the folks back home.

I like the gentleman's amendment. If you do not adopt his amendment, I have another one that will let the area be decontrolled by a vote of the people. I wonder what you would say about that? Do you think the people back home ought to have the right to vote, and let the majority of them say, "We do not want rent control"? What argument would you make against that? Why, bureaucracy is nothing but representative government gone berserk. I think there is a schizophrenia that has developed. A dual personality. Bureaucracy thinks nobody back home knows anything about running their own business. It must be done by all-powerful central government—I maintain that is not always good government.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. The local rent boards at the present time are actually appointed by the Housing Expediter. The Governor submits a list from which the Housing Expediter has to choose, but the Housing Expediter is the man who actually makes the appointment in the last analysis.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOSSETT. May I observe that the rent-control director often does not pay any attention to the recommendations of the local boards. I know of one board that urgently recommended decontrol, and he wholly ignored their recommendation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is true. It has occurred a number of times. I think the reason we have had very few appeals to the courts is that you wear the local people out. The local boards that are appointed are just worn down by the red tape and delay that you must go through before you can possibly get the decontrol. This amendment is simply a democratic procedure.

I say to you who are opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi that you are going to build up a big bureaucracy here in Washington that is going to grow bigger and bigger, and as it grows bigger and bigger it must grow and feed upon itself to survive, and you and your people back home will grow smaller and smaller. I should like to see this thing placed right back home in the laps of the people at home. If you do not like the gentleman's amendment, under which the elected officials will have the final control over rent control, then I am going to ask you to vote for my amendment, under which a majority of the people in the group can vote for decontrol. I do not know whether you will accept that or not. I expect not.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The difficulty in getting a concession from the advocates of this legislation that would amount to anything in the way of relief to the people is that back of the demand there is a purpose to completely federalize the whole subject of housing.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is right, and it disturbs me no end, because here it is some three and a half years after the war and we say a national emergency is still on. The advocates of all-powerful bureaucracy are afraid to let the people at home run their own local business—just where are we headed—a totalitarian state—an all-powerful bureaucracy denying the rights of free people to run their own affairs? That is the road you travel if you reject this amendment.

I admit that there may be some areas where there is some need for rent control, but I also feel there are a great many areas where they do not need it and where the local boards have even advised that controls be taken off, but the Expediter pays no attention to them. Therefore, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi to let the city officials and county officials and State officials say whether rent control should be ended in a certain area. I think that is democratic procedure and ought to be accepted with open arms.

Mr. COX. What possible sane argument can be advanced against the proposal to put this whole subject into the hands of local people? In other words, why be afraid of local control? Why be afraid of self-determination on the part of small or even large communities to determine what they want?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when this amendment was first shown to me by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, it appealed to me very much. It appeared to me to be a reasonable amendment and possibly the most logical approach to the

solution of this problem. But on thinking the matter over in connection with the national emergency and other matters, I have changed my mind. I do not believe that it is the right thing to do. Witness these facts: One, we the Members of Congress were elected when the rent-control question was an issue. The city council was not elected on that issue, and neither was the city council or county commissioners, and neither were the members of the State legislatures, except possibly in very few States. The easiest thing for us to do would be to pass this amendment and just pass the buck and throw this troublesome problem into the laps of people who do not know anything about it. As to whether or not that is the right thing to do, that, of course, is a question for each individual person to determine.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] a while ago said that the local board had made a recommendation that a certain town be decontrolled, and the Housing Expediter refused to decontrol it. There is no reason in the world why that town cannot go into the Emergency Court of Appeals. The Emergency Court of Appeals can decontrol that town or city. It has been done in the past. It was done in the case of Miami, Fla. It does not cost anything. The Emergency Court of Appeals will go to your town and do it quickly. They will do it right now. It will cost you nothing. You have three United States district judges on that court and in a very short time they will pass on the question. If they say that the town should be decontrolled, it is decontrolled and the Housing Expediter, notwithstanding the provision that we have in this bill, cannot decontrol it at all.

So I suggest that since this is an issue which is national in scope and since the city council has never given consideration to this problem, would it be fair to them to turn the problem over to them? In addition to that, in the ordinary county in Texas, I do not know how it is in other counties in the United States, we have four commissioners who compose a commissioners' court. If you have one big city in that county, one of the commissioners comes from the city and the other three from the county, so those four commissioners could get together and decontrol the city, which was located in that county. Very few legislatures have had anything to do with this problem, so why should we try to pass the buck and throw it into the laps of people who have never dealt with the problem and who do not know anything about it, who have never studied it and who are not elected on that issue? I do not think we should do it as nice as the amendment appears to be and as logical as it seems to be at first blush. I think it would be a serious mistake for us to put it into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. Chairman, in the city of Detroit there are two cities entirely contained within that city—two cities of substantial size. Under the terms of this amendment, if it were adopted, the Common Council of the City of Detroit could decontrol or not. The common council of one of the cities within the boundaries of the city of Detroit could control or not, opposite to the decision of the Common Council of Detroit, and the common council of the other city within the city of Detroit could act independently still. The board of supervisors of the county could make still another decision. I dare say the constables of one particular ward conceivably could make their own decision.

It is difficult enough to administer the problems of rent control, but this is piling difficulty onto difficulty so that the bill with the Williams amendment in it reduces itself to an absurdity.

There is talk of handing this back to the people. If the people wanted this kind of an amendment, if the officers of some city or some county or some State legislature wanted this kind of amendment, if the people of our community wanted this kind of amendment, do you not think that some one of them during the lengthy hearings on this bill would have come before the Committee on Banking and Currency and said, "We want the power to go to the townships to decontrol rent control, we want the power to go to the common councils of the cities to decontrol rent control, or we want the power to go to the State legislature."

While there were serious differences of opinion on rent control generally, during the lengthy hearings on this bill no citizen—no local official—ever asked for the provisions of the Williams amendment, and no State official or private citizen asked for such a thing. I am sure nobody could make such a proposition and keep a straight face because it is ridiculous.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the instance which the gentleman has cited of Detroit, do those several councils have uniform ordinances or resolutions on other matters?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Answering the gentleman, I want to point to the absurdity that would result if, one side of the same street, the same type of housing accommodations, had control, and the opposite side of the street, on the same block, had decontrol.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Under this amendment the State legislature might decontrol an entire State, despite the fact that some cities need control, while under the law as it exists you could decontrol the area outside the city and the city could still be under control. You would not have the confusion under existing law as you would get under this amendment, whereby a large area could be decontrolled when it should not be. Is that not so?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman. The possibilities of confusion that would be created by this amendment are almost infinite

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this would seem to me to be a happy solution of this whole problem. It will leave Federal control subject of course to the rights, the autonomy of the local people. Why should it not be that way? Why should we have any fear in our hearts about what the local people are going to do?

Something has been said about the local governing bodies not being elected on this issue. Well, they soon would be elected on this issue or would fail of election on this issue if jurisdiction should be conferred upon them to act. They would be accountable to their own people on this matter if they had power to act. And if the people did not like their actions, as to this matter, they could vote them in or out as the case might be. I think we may safely leave it up to them to determine whether or not it is necessary in the particular locality. One of the Members here argued that such an amendment would bring about confusion. Unless I am misinformed about this whole thing and am in error, new units are decontrolled now, are they not?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. Not at this time. I have the highest regard for the distinguished gentleman from Texas, but I do not yield at this time.

Mr. PATMAN. I merely wanted to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MORRIS. I am sorry, but I cannot yield just now; if I have time later I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. Chairman, this gets back to the proposition of keeping a thing that is good for those who want it and permitting those people who do not want it to do away with it; and why should not they have that right? Yes, it seems to me that it is a happy solution of the whole thing. As I recall, this same amendment went over in the last Congress; there is a slight change in it, but substantially the same amendment, known at that time as the Redden amendment, passed the House. It was taken out in conference or lost in the shuffle somewhere along the line, but it went over. I have the highest regard for the chairman of this committee and for the distinguished gentleman from Texas who spoke against this proposed amendment, and it is no pleasure on my part to oppose them in the matter, but as I observed once before in this House, I observe again, Mr. Chairman: Certainly there is nothing sacrosanct about the report of a committee in presenting a bill to the House. I realize we ought to give great weight to their suggestions; they have studied the matter more carefully ordinarily than we have when we are not on that particular committee, and we should not lightly adopt an amendment; I realize that. We should be

cautious in adopting amendments on the floor because quite often they are not well considered, but that does not mean they never are. I realize what the impact of this amendment might be, but this, to my mind, is clear and convincing, and so far no one has offered any logic or reason to dispel my feeling, that this is a happy solution of the whole problem.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. COX. Is it not the gentleman's feeling that the people of the home town, whether small or large, are better able to determine what is good for them than is Washington?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; it is.

Mr. COX. And that if they do not want rent control which the advocates of this bill admit to be a vicious and wicked thing, a bureaucrat in Washington should not be empowered to impose it upon them.

Mr. MORRIS. I appreciate the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia; I think we can always rely upon our own local home folks.

I now yield to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact there would be a lot of confusion in cities like my own and Bristol, Va., where half the city is in one State and half in another, where they have two city councils acting for two separate cities. The one half might be controlled and the other half decontrolled; would not that create confusion?

Mr. MORRIS. No; I do not think it would because the local council of each city or part of the city would know what their people wanted. The question answers itself.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I do not see how you would handle such a situation, say, as the Oklahoma State Legislature saying, "Let us decontrol," but the city of Oklahoma and its council saying, "We should not decontrol." What are you going to do about that? How would you handle that?

Mr. MORRIS. It would be handled very easily. The State legislature, of course, has power to make laws for the entire State, and that law would be supreme unless there were something to the contrary in the constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to see if we can agree to a limitation of debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Would the gentleman suggest a time?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, was the request on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto or on the section?

Mr. SPENCE. On the pending amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I think the language of this amendment might be somewhat improved. This can be done in conference or by the Senate at a later date. The purpose of the amendment is something for which I have fought for many years, local control of local affairs.

Since I first studied law in the State university at Baton Rouge, La., I formed the definite conviction that real estate was something which should be controlled by local laws. For instance, the form of a deed, mortgage or other instrument must conform to the laws of the State wherein the land or realty is located. Certain matters of proof and other instruments must likewise conform to local laws in almost every State. Real estate has been through the years considered, perhaps more than any other type of property, to be localized property. It cannot be moved from place to place or taken from State to State. It cannot be placed in interstate commerce. It is immobilized and is or should be controlled by local laws and ordinances.

This amendment seeks to give more local control over real estate. It seeks to give the local people who are acquainted with local conditions and local needs the power to control or decontrol rental property. It may be argued that this will result in irregularity in enforcement and in ceilings on rent. This may occur, Mr. Chairman; I will not dispute this position. It may result in one section of the country paying higher rents than in another section. But, Mr. Chairman, who can complain if this irregularity occurs? It is the local people. If some want rents which are somewhat higher than other sections, and prefer this to a rent-controlled economy, they are the ones to be satisfied—not the bureaucrats in Washington. Give the people full voice to decide locally their own problems; and whether the decision be right or wrong, they will be much better satisfied.

I am confident the local people can handle their own problems—even rent control. I am confident that given the full voice in this vexing matter, a better administration and a better regulation and control will come from State or local levels. As for myself, I am perfectly willing that the doctrine of "home rule" be given a chance to operate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I think it ought to be clear what this amendment seeks to do as contrasted with the present law. Under present law you have local option but do not have local license. In other words, the local board can ask for decontrol. The Expediter then passes on it. If he does not agree, it goes to the court. At least that is what it should continue to be under this law, Mr. Chairman. Practically every argument that has been made in favor of the pending amendment is an argument against national rent control, rather than in favor of this amendment—it is an argument that the local communities shall have local option as to whether they want rent control or not, regardless of national policy, need, or emergency.

In the big cities there may well be population shifts should this amendment pass. Within the city of greater Detroit, for instance, as it has just been stated, one segment of the city may be decontrolled and other segments controlled. The same may occur in country counties contiguous to city counties.

There is a national housing shortage, there is a national housing emergency, and it is essential to have a regulating authority at the national level. There is local option in the law now but not to the point of local license; the power is in the Expediter who can look at the whole national picture, but if he acts improperly it is put up to the court. The court is the final authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be given to the gentleman from New York, [Mr. GWINN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The Bureau of the Census by joint resolution studied 34 metropolitan areas in reference to housing. This is a consolidated chart of those findings. I have 33 other charts of various metropolitan areas if anyone wants to ask questions about those areas.

This line reflects in proper scale the 1940 housing situation in those 34 big-city areas. Families renting are shown in green; families living in their own houses are shown in red; doubled-up families are shown in black. In 1940 there were 648,000 of them. That doubling-up was regarded as normal. It took in the servants, couples serving in a family or relatives living in the house. The census listed these as preferring to live doubled-up rather than in other space. Since there was in 1940 a 7-percent vacancy that would have housed all doubled-up families, we may treat 1940 doubling-up as entirely normal.

We had three classes of housing property unutilized then. The same is true now. First the wholly vacant houses built and suitable for occupancy in blue color. There is the red showing one-person-owner occupancy. And the green shows one-person-tenant occupancy. Both are abnormal and uneconomic because they were all built for family occupancy.

This long line is the 1947 picture. This includes the new housing built from 1940 to 1947. This black space represents all doubling-up, the normal doubling-up and the abnormal doubling-up, due to the shortage of rental space. Half of that black space is abnormal.

We then take that abnormal doubling up black space and compare it with the length of the line showing the space available in the Nation into which the doubled-up families could move. Here in blue is the vacant space, good housing, capable of being occupied, but taken off the rental market and listed for sale. The red shows property occupied by one person who owns his own house or apartment. He ought to have two or three persons in this house because they are all built for families and not for bachelors. The green shows the number of houses occupied and rented by one tenant. So, the abnormal number of families doubled up could move into this space if we could get rid of rent control. The space vacant or abnormally occupied would take care of two or three times the number of families needing space. In some areas it runs more than five times the requirements.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Who prepared those charts?

Mr. GWINN. These charts were prepared by an engineer named Usher in Chicago. They are absolutely according to scale and according to the Bureau of the Census figures.

Mr. PERKINS. My point is: Who had those charts prepared?

Mr. GWINN. They were prepared in Chicago for representation of the housing situation today.

Mr. PERKINS. Did the gentleman request the preparation of those charts?

Mr. GWINN. No; I just learned of them yesterday when they were brought to the Senate, and pending the Senate hearings I asked that they be brought over here so that I might present them to the House today.

Mr. PERKINS. What organization sponsored the preparation of those charts?

Mr. GWINN. I said that Mr. Usher, an engineer, prepared them; a very responsible man in Chicago. I have checked them and I can say that they are correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. I believe the gentleman from New York has two or three other charts on individual cities which follow through on this matter. I wonder if the gentleman would take the time to explain those two charts. It is a most unusual situation.

Mr. GWINN. This is a very interesting chart of Seattle. Here is the abnormal or doubled-up population in Seattle. That is half of this black area here. At the same time Seattle has all of these vacant dwelling units all built for family occupation. It includes no old or unsuitable housing, no hotel rooms. They are complete family units, vacant, taken off the rental market and up for sale. Without rent control, this abnormal doubling up could move into that vacant space and still have plenty of space. In Seattle this area shows the number of houses now occupied by one person, either a surviving wife or husband or uncle or aunt that is still living in that space which they own. This great line of green here shows the one-person occupancy of rented property. So there is five or six times more space than is needed in Seattle that would be immediately available if we could get rid of rent control and operate a free economy. These are census figures.

Wilkes-Barre is even more interesting. Wilkes-Barre showed a falling off in population of 15 percent, but in spite of the reduction in population in Wilkes-Barre by 15 percent which left an abnormal increase in vacancies you still have this same old abnormal doubling up. The people who own rental property in Wilkes-Barre are doing exactly what they are doing everywhere else, taking their property off the rental market. They are vacant. People want to sell, to quit their business because Government forces a loss upon them. Here is the space, a tremendous space, occupied by single persons who own their places. Here is the space rented by single persons all because of rent control. The absurd consequences of rent control shutting people out of ample housing is demonstrated in every area examined.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I want to be fair in this thing, but if we stop to think at all, I do not see how this amendment could possibly work in my State or in any State where we have so many political subdivisions. As I understood the wording of the amendment, any political subdivision could decontrol. You would have simply a situation of hopeless confusion. Would the county commissioners, who are not essentially a legislative body in Ohio but are members of a political subdivision, have the power to decontrol? I think they would. The township trustees would have the power to decontrol, as would the village and city councils, and we have many villages and cities within two townships. Suppose the township trustees in one township decontrolled and the other township did not; who would have the jurisdiction, the city council, or the township trustees of the township that decontrolled, or the township trustees of the one that did not, or could the county commissioners step in and take jurisdiction?

I think this amendment if adopted would just tie this law into a mass of organized confusion and litigation, and in effect there would not be any rent control. I have confidence in local officials and local governments, but if you are going to give any kind of power to local governments you certainly are going to have to define and make some distinctions. You cannot just hand them out and let the chips fall where they may, with nobody knowing who has the power to do what. I submit to you that this amendment would simply confuse the issue in my State until we will not have any rent control and the whole matter will wind up in endless litigation in the courts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the gentleman's argument is nothing but water coloring. He knows that a city is within a county and a county is within a State. If a city decontrols it applies to the city. If the county decontrols it applies to the county; and if the State decontrols, it likewise applies to the State.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Not necessarily under the wording of this amendment. The amendment is poorly drawn and defines nothing to show who has final authority. Neither does it show where control rests in subdivisions within two or more other subdivisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, out of this discussion arises the question which I desire to propound to my brethren: Are you afraid of the people who sent you here? Do you trust them to make a right determination of a matter that affects them in a local sort of way?

Mr. Chairman, a vote for this amendment is to answer "Yes." A vote against the amendment is to answer "No."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be allotted to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN], a member of the committee, a question, if he is on the floor. Or perhaps the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], can answer the question which has to do with local control. The question is, Does the local expediter have the power to absolutely select the local control board and put the board into operation?

Mr. PATMAN. Under an amendment put in the law, the last law that was passed, the governor of each State submits his recommendation to the Housing Expediter. I think the Housing Expediter has the power to select from that list.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the Housing Expediter have the power to refuse to select board members from the list of names submitted by the governor?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not in a position to answer that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], that question? Does the Expediter have the power to refuse to appoint from lists of names submitted by the governors?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The law says he shall appoint a board from the recommendations by the governor. If the governor fails to give him a list of nominees, then the Expediter on his own initiative can set up a board.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Expediter can create a local board outside of the recommendations of the governor?

Mr. WOLCOTT. He can, if the governor refuses or fails to act.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the situation if, after the governor has submitted the list of names to the Expediter, he refuses to appoint anyone to that list?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I answer that question?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Just a moment. I gave the gentleman a chance to answer a question, but he did not seem to know the answer. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] that question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I assume that he would communicate with the governor and ask for the resubmission of names. But if the list was representative, then he would have to name the board from the list. Is that not right?

Mr. PATMAN. I believe that is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Suppose the governor has a request from the Expediter to submit a new list, and then the governor refuses to do so, then what can the Expediter do?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the list is representative, he has to name the board from the list submitted by the governor.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is, the Expediter does?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But if the governor refuses to submit another list on the assumption by the governor that his previous list was representative, then what can the Expediter do?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is getting pretty technical and involved.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I know it is getting technical, and that is the reason I want to develop the matter here at this time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not think there is any provision for a determination by the Expediter as to whether or not the list is representative. If the governor complies with the law and submits a list, it is presumed to be a representative list, and the Expediter has no alternative but to name from that list. If he has objection to the list, as I said, he probably would communicate with the governor and ask him to submit new names, but if the governor refused to do so, then he would be bound by the original list, if it were representative, under the law.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Are there any cases before the committee where the Expediter has refused to select names from the list submitted by the governor?

Mr. WOLCOTT. There might have been some.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] answer that, please?

Mr. GAMBLE. My understanding is that in certain cases he has refused.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think you will find that under the present set-up there is no local control of material consequence and which is sufficiently effective to meet public necessity and convenience.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has expired.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] may have the 2 minutes allotted to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a little time here. This is my first request this session; and I take time now only because I believe it important to acknowledge and approve the remarks made here last Friday by the majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK.

He said then that the continuance of rent control is essentially an urban or city problem and he appealed to members serving rural districts to view it from that angle. He then reminded us that in the days to come we must bring here for your consideration, legislation relating to the rural or agricultural sections of the country, and which will be important to the standard of living and economic welfare of those who till the soil.

He urged that those Members particularly concerned with problems relating to agriculture give to the problems of our great cities the same degree of sympathy and understanding that we want and expect of those who seek to serve here the urban or city areas.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, if we sincerely seek to protect and preserve the welfare of all sections and all groups, if we would build and maintain one great Nation, prosperous and united, if we would do unto others as we would that they do unto us, we must give our most sympathetic consideration to this appeal by our majority leader.

It is only a little while before we must bring here legislation of the most urgent necessity to the farmers of the Nation. I would not want the Members from the city districts to view our farm problems without sympathy or to cast their votes on a purely selfish basis.

I am sure, then, that those of us who serve farm districts will not be wanting in sympathy and understanding of the problems faced today by those who serve our great city districts.

I am sure we will not be unmindful of the fact that it is these millions in our great cities who provide the market for our farm commodities, and that we serve best the interests of the farmers when we seek to protect the economic welfare and a good standard of living for those who consume the products of the farm. There is a dependence of one upon the other—there is a community of interest which calls upon our most sympathetic consideration of the problems of each.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] on the 4-minute speech which he has just made. It is a timely reminder to some of the Members of this House whose problems are agricultural, that we in the cities have problems, too. I call the attention of my friends in the agricultural districts to the many times when Members from the cities, such as myself, have gone through the tellers and have gone down on the roll call in favor of agricultural policies when we could well have voted the other way. From a selfish standpoint, every penny that is taken out of the wage earners' pockets in the cities for increased rentals, is taken away from his purchasing power of the things that are produced in the factories and in the fields of this Nation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I have only 2 minutes; I regret that I cannot yield.

Every decrease in the purchasing power of the individual wage earner, which is limited mostly in the cities of the Nation, removes from his abilty to purchase the food that goes on his table. That is why we are fighting so desperately against this last break in the dike of inflation; it is so that these wage earners who are the consuming buyers in the cities can go ahead and live decently, and in order to live decently they have to be able to buy food.

There is an old saying that "The parents have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge." We are faced today, in the consideration of the rent-control bill, with an attempt to correct an almost impossibly complicated situation. The sins of omission and commission of the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses have had their effect on today's impossible situation.

Rent control was just part of the attempt to prevent the tide of inflation from engulfing the common people of the United States. When the Seventy-ninth Congress and the Eightieth Congress wrecked price control almost in toto, they caused the inflation to occur, which has now risen to the point of danger to our economic structure. The Seventy-ninth Congress started the job of wrecking price control and laid the foundation for the present inflation when they destroyed the effectiveness of price control: First, by denying adequate appropriations for administrating and enforcing it; second, by the adoption of crippling amendments which made effective price control almost impossible. The Eightieth Congress was more direct in its action

and its purposes; it deliberately repealed many of the inflationary controls. It also reduced appropriations for administration of the remaining controls to the point where it was impossible to properly administer the weak laws which remained.

Many of us who have had business experience realized in the latter part of 1945, 1946, and 1947 that, while the war was over, the economic maladjustments which were caused by the war were still facing the American people. We realized the necessity of orderly transition to a normal peacetime economy. We fought to preserve controls over short supplies and we fought for adequate funds to properly administer and enforce such laws as remained pertaining to price control and the fight against inflation. We were unsuccessful. The slogan of the inflationists, "The war is over" and "Back to normalcy" was a popular one, and our voices crying against the destruction of wartime controls until peacetime normal conditions had been attained were voices crying in the wilderness.

Practically every control over short supplies in our economy has been removed. In practically every incidence we have seen inflationary rises in prices, which have now reached, in my opinion, their peak.

Prices on the necessities of life have risen to a point that a virtual buyer's or consumer's strike is beginning throughout the Nation. Inventories on the merchants' shelves are at an all-time high. Statistics on retail sales are beginning to show a decrease. Soft-goods manufacturers are beginning to curtail production. They are beginning to work short workweeks. They are beginning to discharge their employees. Unemployment is growing throughout the Nation. Once again the vicious circle of boom and bust seems to be approaching.

The average consumer has had a decrease in take-home wages. Although he has received a few cents in hourly wage increases in the last 2 or 3 years, the decreased purchasing power of the dollar has taken care of his monetary wage increases. Short workweeks and lack of overtime have decreased his take-home wages, and inflationary prices have decreased his consuming power. The last remaining defense against further decreases in the consuming power of the wage earner stands before us today in the form of the last remaining control law—the rent-control law. The millions of wage earners, already hard pressed by inflationary living costs and decreased take-home pay, are now facing a further blow if rent controls are removed. In my opinion, this last blow at the consuming power of America's working millions may be the straw which breaks the camel's back. It may be the last factor which will throw us into an economic tail spin.

Drastically increased rent can mean only one thing at this time. It means a larger slice out of the take-home pay of the workers who are the renters in America. If a larger slice is devoted to rent purposes, then there will be less remaining to expend for the goods which are produced in the factories and fields of America.

A lessened consuming power is inevitably reflected in curtailed production. Curtailed production means unemployment. Unemployment means depression.

Let me sound a note of warning before this last defense in consuming power is swept away. If we can at this time pass a reasonable rent-control bill, if we can, at the proper time, appropriate enough money for fair and equitable administration, for the correction of the maladjustment in the administration of rent control, of which we are all aware and which we all deplore, I say again: If we can pass a strengthened rent-control bill which will provide some protection for the consuming power of America, and at the same time provide for fair and reasonable adjustment to the landlord who is entitled to protection, we may halt the debacle. We may temporarily prevent what I believe will be an inevitable depression with all its fearful consequences.

A year ago today I stood on the floor of the House and condemned the rent-control bill of the Eightieth Congress. I predicted that the condition of chaos, which has occurred, would occur, because I knew that the bill was not an extension of rent control in the proper sense, but it was a weakening of the previous rent-control law by the amendments and provisions which had been provided for in the 1948 bill, and that it would create the present condition of chaos throughout the rental areas of America.

I voted against the 1948 rent-control extension bill because it was, in my opinion, a "political" bill; it was a dishonest bill. I hope that I will be able to vote for the bill which is to be presented to us today. I believe that it has been strengthened in some respects. I am apprehensive that there may not be enough funds appropriated to correct the maladjustments which now exist, or to review the inequities which I know exist at the present time.

The bill which we have before us, however, is a stronger bill than the 1948 bill. It does provide for some greater degree of protection to the renters, than was provided for by the Eightieth Congress bill, and it does provide for reasonable returns to the landlord, which in my opinion, they are entitled to.

In my opinion the Williams amendment to restore the determination for decontrol of rent areas to local political subdivisions is not only administratively unworkable but unconstitutional. Rent-control legislation rests upon the Supreme Court declaration of a national emergency. National legislation such as the rent-control bill is the only justifiable way to handle a national emergency.

It is my hope that the Senate will remove this amendment when their rent legislation is under consideration.

We are faced therefore with the practical problem of having to accept a bill which is far from ideal.

In the hope that the bill will be improved as it moves through the further legislative steps of Senate consideration and conference agreement, I must support the unsatisfactory measure now before us. I shall, therefore, reluctantly vote for the bill, in the hope that there will be adequate appropriations voted for effective administration, enforcement, and improvement by Senate and conference change.

I reserve the right to vote against the measure when it returns from conference, if such improvement does not occur.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] is recognized.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I introduced a similar amendment in the House committee, but I wish to take this time to reply to two statements which have been made here on the floor in connection with local control. The first statement is that there having been only 14 local-board recommendations for decontrol was evidence of the fact that the local areas did not want decontrol. I want to point out to you, however, some of the things that the local board must do in order to secure decontrol. I made this statement in my original speech the other day but I want to call it to your attention again. Just remember that these local boards are voluntary boards of citizens working without pay.

First. They must put down the estimated population of the principal cities in the rental area.

Second. They must put down the anticipated increases or decreases in population.

Third. They must find out what the general trend of employment was during the past 6 months.

Fourth. They must put down the anticipated changes in total employment in the next 90 days. Think of the size of this task for instance, in the city of Chicago.

Fifth. They must make a list of all the students in the entire rental area. There may be many colleges, but they have to find out who the students are living with, whether they are living with their parents, with a wife, or with other members of their family.

Sixth. They have to find out approximately the number of families and individuals seeking housing accommodations in the area.

Seventh. They have to find out the extent of rent decreases, if any, during the past 6 months, and they have to specify just what those decreases have been and the various types of property in which they have occurred.

Eighth. They would have to put down the prospective trends in rent if rent control should be removed.

Ninth. They have to list all habitable, nonseasonal dwellings, of the class or classes affected by the recommendation, which are now vacant and offered for sale.

A local board might have a little difficulty in doing that. I think now it is probably better understood why we have not had many local-board recommendations for decontrol.

Then I want to reply to the argument with reference to the fact that the Housing Expediter can make a better survey of the situation than the local boards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] is recognized.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment. I have, earlier in the debate, expressed my views on this bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, the merits and demerits of rent control as administered since the enactment of the original law have been ably presented through long hours of debate here on the floor of the House.

Our own country has gone through these years of experience; however, rent control is not so new in Europe. In France, rent control was invoked years ago. In France this innovation has had an opportunity to demonstrate success or failure. I have been much interested in an article in the February issue of the Reader's Digest and, pursuant to the permission granted to me by the House, I am calling the attention of the membership to that article, written by Bertrand de Jouvenel, noted French economist, and which reads as follows:

NO VACANCIES

A dollar a month pays a wage earner's rent in Paris; quarters adequate for a family of six cost $2 (equivalent to 11 packages of the cheapest cigarettes). Middle-class apartments of three or four main rooms frequently cost from $1.50 to $2.50 per month. Important officials or executives pay from $3.50 a month to $8 or $10 a month.

This may seem a desirable state of affairs, but there are draw-backs. There are no vacant lodgings, nor is anyone going to vacate, nor can the owners expel anyone. Young couples must live with in-laws. Practically no housing has been built for the last 12 years.

The only opportunity to get quarters is to watch for deaths. Tottering old people sunning themselves in public gardens are shadowed back to their flat by an eager young wife who strikes a bargain with the concierge to be first in at the death. Other apartment chasers have an understanding with funeral parlors.

There are two ways of obtaining an apartment made available by death. Legally, if you fulfill certain conditions which give you priority, you may obtain an order of requisition, but usually you find that the same order for the same apartment has been given to two or three other applicants. The illegal method is the surest—an arrangement with the heir that some pieces of your furniture be carried in immediately upon death of the tenant. As soon as you are in you are the king of the castle.

Buying one's way into an apartment will cost anywhere from $500 to $1,500 per room. Wage earners might as well give up hope of setting up house; they have to stay with their families or live in miserable hotels.

Paris has 84,000 buildings for habitation, almost 90 percent of them built before World War I. Even a very lenient officialdom estimates that 16,000 are in such disrepair that they should be pulled down. Nor are the others altogether satisfacory; 82 perent of Parisians have no bath, more than half must go out of their lodgings to find a lavatory and a fifth do not even have running water. Little more than one in six of the existing buildings is pronounced in good condition by the public inspectors.

Owners are not financially able to keep up their buildings, let alone improve them. To take an example of a very common situation, there is a woman who owns three buildings containing 34 apartments, all inhabited by middle-class families. Her net loss from the 34 apartments, after taxes and repairs, is $80 per year. Not only must her son take care of her, but he must also pay out the $80. She cannot sell; there are no buyers.

When the owner tries to milk a little net income from his property by cutting down the repairs, he runs great risks. One landlord postponed repairs on his roofs and rain filtering into an apartment spoiled a couple of armchairs. He was sued for damages and condemned to pay a sum amounting to three years of the tenant's paltry rent. Since 1914, rents at the most have multiplied 6.8 times, while taxes have multiplied 13.2 times, and repairs cost from 120 to 150 times the 1914 price.

An outsider may be tempted to think that only an incredible amount of folly can have led us to this condition. But it is not so. We got there by easy, almost unnoticed stages, slipping down on the gentle slope of rent control. And this was not the work of the Reds but of succeeding governments, most of which were considered rather conservative.

The story starts with World War I. It then seemed humane and reasonable to stabilize housing costs while the boys were in the Army or working for victory. So existing rentals were frozen. It was also reasonable to avoid disturbances at the end of the war lest the veterans' homecoming be spoiled by evictions and rent increases. Thus prewar situations hardened into rights. The owner lost—temporarily, of course—the disposition of his property.

When the situation was reviewed in 1926, retail prices had trebled, and it was plain that lifting controls would bring huge rent increases. The legislators shrank from this crisis and decided to confirm the tenant's right to stay in possession but to raise rents slightly. A new owner-tenant relationship thus took shape. The owner was powerless either to evict the tenant or to discuss the rent with him. The State took care of the price which rose slowly, while regulation was extended to bring in flats not previously regulated. Only buildings put up since 1915 were left unregulated, this to stimulate construction.

No systematic view inspired this policy. It just grew from the fear of a sudden return to liberty which seemed ever more dangerous as prices stepped up. And, of course, if one must control the price of rent, one could not allow the owner to dismiss tenants, because in that case he might so easily have stipulated secretly with the new tenants.

As rent-control lawmaking continued—no single subject has taken up so much of the time and energy of Parliament—the real income from buildings crumbled from year to year. Then came World War II. The return to liberty which had been devised for 1943 was, of course, abandoned, and all rents were frozen, including those of recent buildings which had till then escaped.

Since the liberation, new laws have provided for increases in rents, but retail prices increased much more. To put it briefly, owners of new buildings (built since 1914) have been allowed, in terms of real income, less than a tenth of what they got before World War II. Owners of old buildings, that is, nine-tenths of all buildings, have been allowed in terms of real income either 12 percent of what they got in 1939 or a little less than 7 percent of what they got in 1914—whichever is less.

If today a builder were to put up apartments, they would have to rent for prices from 10 to 13 times present rent ceilings, in order to break even. Thus, according to a report of the Economic Council, a wage earner's apartment of three small rooms and a kitchen now renting for $13 to $16 a year would have to be rented for $166 to $200 a year. Obviously, construction will not be undertaken. * * *

Such is the spread between the legal and the economic price of lodgings that even the most fervent advocates of freedom shudder at the thought of its return; the thing, they say, has gone too far, and the right to dismiss tenants, if restored, could not be executed. The whole Nation of tenant would go on a sit-down strike.

Hence the strange plans now being considered by the French Parliament, which would continue the tenant's right to retain his lodgings but would set a fair rent, part to come from the tenant and the rest from a special subsidy—an inflationary measure, of course, as are all subsidies.

Not all this fair rent would go to the owner. A slice to correspond with the cost of the upkeep would be paid to his credit in a blocked account, to make sure it did go for repairs. A much bigger slice for the reconstitution of the capital would not go to the owner at all but to a national fund for building. Thus the dispossession of the owners would be finally sanctioned; they would be legally turned into the janitors of their own buildings, while on the basis of their dispossession a new state ownership of future buildings would rear its proud head.

The French example may prove of some interest and use to our friends across the sea. It goes to show that rent control is self-perpetuating and culminates in both the physical ruin of housing and the legal dispossession of the owners. The havoc wrought in France is not the work of the enemy but is the result of our own measures.

Mr. Chairman, does the United States want to follow in the footsteps of France so far as housing is concerned? The enactment of this bill without amendment is a direct step toward that which France is now experiencing. Rent control does not produce more homes for our people. It produces less. If autocratic, discriminatory rent control is continued long enough, there will be no privately owned housing for rent. It necessarily follows that the Government must then provide homes for everyone, if the people are to have housing. When this happens socialism will reign supreme in the housing field.

Mr. Chairman, do we want that? Certainly not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if rent control is necessary, I think this is a desirable amendment.

A few moments ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], made the observation that this amendment would produce absurdities in that we would have certain units within a county or State controlled and others, maybe just across the street, decontrolled. If that is true, I say there are under the present law comparable absurdities. I can best illustrate that by my own district. In the Fifth District of Michigan we have two counties. During the active part of the war, both counties were under rent control. Some time during 1945 or 1946, the Housing Expediter decontrolled one county. As a result we can walk across a county line and be in a decontrolled area. If we stay in the other county we have control. That condition may be absurd. In fact, I believe it is, but we will not amplify or enlarge such unfortunate situations under the present amendment. All such absurdities result from patchwork rent control, including all rent-control legislation since VJ-day.

I would like to say one thing about the previous comments of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE]. The local boards under the present law and this bill are not able to do a 100-percent job through no fault of their own. These

men and women are local civic-minded individuals who serve without pay. Because they have personal responsibilities and obligations they are not able to undertake the immense job required of them, as a board, to find out whether or not rent control should be continued in their local area. The locally elected officials, whether they be State legislators or city commissioners, have a responsibility because the people have put them in office; they are paid for the job. They are familiar with local conditions. They can undertake a determination whether or not there should be a continuation of rent control in their local area.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the pending amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the pending amendment, although in all frankness I must say, of course, that I am opposed to the principle of Federal rent control. However, an amendment of this sort which seeks to place again in the hands of the people of this country and at the grass-roots level the matter of determination of the necessity or the absence of the necessity for continuing rent control does seem to me to represent the kind of action that is essential if Federal rent control is to be continued.

Much has been said about the chaos that would result if this amendment were adopted, but, Mr. Chairman, I can think of nothing in this great country that matches the chaos presently obtaining in most of the local boards. It is one of those things where if you intend to go down to a board to seek a small increase, you had best put up the storm shutters in the middle of the summer, stop the milk and all of the newspapers, and put the children out with some relatives because you are not going to be back for a long time to come. So, as far as chaos is concerned, I do not think it is fair to speak of the two types of chaos in the same breath.

Where are the local governments deficient? They are not deficient in providing adequate police and fire protection. They are not inadequate in assessing and collecting taxes. They are not inadequate in their legislative structures nor in the judicial powers vested in them. To my mind, the subdivisions of government are much more adequate and they are much better equipped to determine whether or not in their particular locality a need exists for continued Federal rent control.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be given to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, two questions come up at this time that should cause us some concern. No. 1: Local officials are charged with certain duties and responsibilities by city charter. This will not be one of their duties. Local commissioners of the counties are charged with certain duties and responsibilities by State law. This cannot be one of their duties. They would not have to carry it out if they did not want to. State legislators have their duties defined by the constitution of their State or by the laws enacted by their legislature. This question of enforcing rent control or removing rent control is not a part of their duties, and they will certainly not be required to carry it out.

Furthermore, I doubt that the Congress will be doing a very good public-relations job if it puts upon the backs of these local officials the duty and responsibility which they cannot legally assume under the definition of their duties under State laws and city charters. We are just placing the duty on them which they do not want. It is possible they will resent it, not only the city officials but the county officials and the State legislature as well. It is possible they might even accuse the Congress, having this problem for a number of years, of lacking in courage, in failing to carry it on in peacetime as well as in time of war, and that criticism might become a rather potent criticism. For those reasons I think that we should be very careful about placing duties and burdens and responsibilities upon people who cannot be compelled to pay any attention to them or to observe them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing the patriotic, sound-thinking people of America are concerned about more than any one other thing, it is the ever-increasing tendency toward centralization of government here in Washington. We have an opportunity here under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to place this matter right back home upon a local self-government basis, home rule, if you please. I hope I will not hear so much about this bureaucracy from some of these people who claim that they believe in home rule and keeping the Government close to the people and at the same time vote against this amendment.

The proponents of this legislation contend that this amendment is unworkable. They argued the same thing about the Brown amendment when they were before the Committee on Rules seeking a rule to bring this bill to the floor of the House, but, when they found that they needed the Brown amendment in order to make this bill more palpable, they agreed to the Brown amendment upon the floor.

I think this pending amendment could be improved upon. I recognize the difficulty of administration, as pointed out here on the floor of the House in the question of a conflict between a municipality and a county; but this is a simple matter which can be worked out in conference between the two bodies, should the Senate see fit to pass a bill.

It is rather difficult to reconcile the views of some of those opposing this amendment with their asserted opinions on other matters of States' rights and local self-government. Certainly they should vote for this amendment or cease prating about States' rights.

On the general question of rent control, however, Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion that we should remove this wartime control. That it was justified during the war is unquestionable, but the war has been over for four years. I venture the assertion that if this legislation is continued this year this bureaucracy will find ample and plausible argument and justification for its continuing many more years.

These Government agencies are human beings, just like you and I. They can never find a good time to abolish an agency or their jobs. With the assertion that it will work a hardship in some cases I find no fault; but, on the other hand, the same argument could be made for controls in all other phases of our economy. To my mind, the argument for the continuing of this control is in line with the arguments advanced for all other forms of the regimentation of our people, the socialization of America. Somewhere along the line we must call a halt on this. So far as I am concerned, regardless of what course others may pursue, I shall vote against giving further life to this unnecessary agency; but, if it is to be continued, with the enormous expense to the already overburdened taxpayers of this country, I should prefer to have it upon an optional, self-governing basis, as provided in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, there is more involved in this bill and this amendment than meets the naked eye. This is the real test, the first test, as to whether we shall continue in an orderly manner to decontrol in an orderly fashion or whether we shall return to a fashion of chaos and imponderables.

Can you conceive of a situation in some 48 States, in thousands of local communities where a tight housing situation still exists, where more than 2,000,000 young people, young newly created families, who are living doubled up, where in the greater portion of these families are veterans and their wives? They are predominantly young people starting out in married life, rearing a family. He has since his discharge from the service faced the economic situation and the cold reality of having been squeezed in the inflation. If this situation were to prevail, I am sure there would be no uniformity, there would be confusion and chaos. I ask that you retain the committee amendment and vote this, the so-called Williams amendment, down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the text of this amendment as I read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday stated that the power of de-

control shall be vested in a resolution by the State legislature or by any county, municipality or political subdivision. It does not use the words, "an act" of a State legislature, which would include action by the governor, who is the chief officer of the State, with State-wide responsibility, including both rural and urban populations. It does not say, "an act of the legislature." The text of this amendment says a resolution of the legislature, which has no constitutional effect to override a resolution of any of the other bodies named.

The gentleman who followed me in debate said that this confusion between governmental subdivisions would be cured because the act of the legislature would take precedence over every political subdivision. Under the text of this amendment decontrol does not lodge in an act of the legislature which would include the governor, but it lodges in a resolution of the State legislature or political subdivision, or county, or municipality which excludes the governor. Under the text of the bill which the committee has brought in, the governor is granted power of decontrol through appointments to rent-control boards which he initiates.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, from the point of view of any tenant residing in the city of New York it would be far better for the Congress to pass no Rent Control Act rather than to pass one that has been unduly weakened by crippling amendments. We should rely upon the information given by the local officials. The great mayor of the city of New York, Gen. William O'Dwyer, appeared before the Banking Committee of the other body and there presented his experienced views. He has drawn also from the experience of the able counsel of the New York City Rent Commission, the Honorable Nathan W. Math, with whom it has been and is my pleasure to work closely in the matter of solving such pressing problems as that which confronts our great city in the matter of the housing shortage. The present act should not be weakened but should rather be strengthened. Provisions should be made to afford the tenant an opportunity to be heard on any notice of application for increase. Present practice, apparently, gives to the tenant only notice of such application which is generally followed by what is locally known as the laundry ticket which is a notice of increase granted under the hardship provision. The inclusion in the law of such a hardship provision removes the need for any so-called reasonable return provision and rather than impede the administration of the act with the tremendous detail that will be involved in applying any such reasonable-return provision we might better consider strengthening such administration so as to afford the tenants an opportunity to be heard on any application for increase made by the landlord. This procedure not only will prevent hardship and insure reasonable return to the landlord but will strengthen the popular support of this measure which is now and will continue to be needed until the number of dwelling units begins to meet the great demand. The insuring of the foregoing is, in my opinion, necessary before any bill presented might properly be described as a Rent Control Act, and I hope that the committee and the House will act upon these suggestions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I believe we are all agreed that so far as we attempt to exercise rent control authority, we must depend upon a finding by us, supportable by the Supreme Court, that there is a national emergency. I believe we are also agreed that in saying that there is an emergency we mean it is temporary and that the time will come when we will have to decontrol. It seems to me that gentlemen in opposition to this amendment have entirely failed to establish that there is now presently existing a national emergency. Rather they have shown that from 1,700 rent-control areas, the requirement has decreased until now they admit there are only 500 such areas, one-fifth of which are border-line areas. It seems to me, as a new Member, that if we are going to go through a period of decontrol we can ask for no better proposition than that offered by this amendment because it guarantees to the people in the country, who want rent control, supervision by an experienced agency and still grants them the right to have local legislatures declare whether or not the people of that area believe rent control is presently necessary. I say again it is incumbent upon us when we vote on this amendment to determine whether there presently exists a national emergency. Rather, what has been doubtfully shown in my opinion is presently existing local emergencies. The function has become a local problem under our Constitution. I therefore recommend that we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. What did these gentlemen who made the deal here to do away with decontrol in certain favored regions of the country do? What did they do with chaos and confusion when they made that deal?

Mr. WERDEL. The gentleman assumes that I admit there was a deal made. I do not know whether there has been or not. I do know that all of you gentlemen understand as well as I that men in public office, whether they be local or national, are inclined to want to perpetuate themselves in office.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I hope the majority leader, when he speaks, will give us the list of communities to be decontrolled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to take just a moment to again indicate to the Members of the House that there is no mysterious list of areas that are likely to be decontrolled in the near future. I said on the floor of the House last week that if any Member wanted the information as to what those areas were or any details as to any part of the approximately 100 areas, all he had to do was to lift up the telephone and ask the Expediter for the information and he would get it. As a matter of fact, on Friday the entire list was released to the newspapers. This morning I asked the Expediter's office for a copy of the list. It was made available to me as it will be made available to any man who sincerely and in good faith asks for the information.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman indicates he has so much good faith, will the gentleman be faithful enough to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the list so we can have it?

Mr. MULTER. May I have unanimous consent to extend the list at this point in the RECORD, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole is not empowered to give that consent. It must be obtained in the House.

Mr. MULTER. If any Member of the House wants to see the list, I have it here, and he can have the use of it. If you want one of your own, you can ask the Expediter for it and he will give it to you.

Now, a word as to this amendment.

This amendment will confuse and confound the entire situation. As has been said before, if you do not want rent control, at the right moment stand up and vote against it, but do not emasculate the bill with an amendment like this. There are any number of areas in this country where the legislatures of the States have concurrent jurisdiction with the local municipalities. By this amendment a State may eliminate rent control even where one of its municipalities needs it.

If the State takes it away from that municipality, there is no way of putting it back if this amendment should prevail. Under the bill, as presented by the committee, there is ample provision for decontrolling areas, large or small, as well as parts of areas.

The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has expired.

There are two other names that the Chair has called. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I made no request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the time allowed to the committee be given to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is

recognized for five additional minutes, or a total of 7 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has many apparent weaknesses. I say this, recognizing that my friend is offering the amendment with the finest of motives. Anything I say is in no way to be remotely construed as questioning the motives of my good friend.

If this amendment is adopted we have an anomalous situation on the part of political subdivisions, from the State down, having an alternative position to one that is already in the bill. We now have local boards appointed by the governors. They can make recommendations. That is written into the law. These boards cover rental areas. A rental area may cover anywhere from 2 to 10 counties. It may cover several municipalities, as well as some adjoining rural area. However, they have authority and jurisdiction within their powers, over the entire rental area that they are appointed as a board to function in.

Under this bill they continue to exist and they continue their powers. If they make recommendations for recontrol in whole or in part and they can function effectively for decontrol in whole or in part, if it is disapproved by the Expediter, then they can go to the emergency court of appeal. That right exists under the law as it stands now, and it will exist under the law if this bill, with that provision therein, is finally enacted into law.

Certainly there should not be both propositions. To my mind, the one that already exists is the soundest way to meet the considerations of decontrol problems. Let us examine the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. "If the legislature or comparable governing body of any State." What is a comparable governing body in any State comparable to the legislature? I know of none. What body exists in any State of the Union comparable to the legislative body of any one of the several States? What comparable body exists in the Federal Government to the Congress of the United States? That means legislative. The legislature or any comparable governing body of a State is one thing, but suppose it descends to any municipality, or county, or other political subdivision; in addition to the boards provided for by existing law in this bill they will have the right by resolution to bring about decontrol. Suppose, as in the case of Detroit, so ably described by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'BRIEN], there are three cities, for all practical purposes, embraced in one rental area; if the governing body of one of those cities passes a resolution for decontrol what effect will it have upon the others? What effect will it have upon the rental area? Take the case of an area of two or more counties—some of them as high as 10 counties I understand for some rental areas; does this mean the entire 10 counties in the rental area? Does it mean that there must be a majority of them? Or does it mean that any one county within the rental area that includes several counties can act independently of the others or of the duly elected officials of the other counties?

What is a resolution? We have concurrent resolutions in the Congress; we have joint resolutions; one has to be signed by the President, the President can veto it, and to make it effective we have to pass it over his veto as provided by the Constitution; the other does not have to be signed by the President but has the force of law when passed by both branches of the Congress. We have therefore two types of resolutions here from a legislative angle in the legislative processes of the Congress itself. What is a resolution in a State? Does a resolution call for action on the part of the Governor? Some resolutions do not; some resolutions may. Does the gentleman from Mississippi want to exclude the governor of a commonwealth from considering this question? And yet under this resolution in some States the governor may be excluded, and in some States the governor may not be excluded. What about a municipality? Under the local charter of a municipality a resolution might be the action of a city council, if that is the name of the body, and might not require the signature or approval of the mayor. In the city of Boston, under the city charter, unless the mayor approves it, the action of the city council does not become effective. There is no necessity of the mayor because the city charter of Boston was drafted by a Republican legislature along the lines of a corporation and not a public agency of the people.

The net result of the effect of this amendment, if adopted, will be to create such confusion that the very purposes of this legislation will be defeated. For the reasons I have expressed, recognizing the honesty of my friend's motive, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 191, noes 148.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. PATMAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 198, noes 150.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Kansas: On page 31, strike out lines 11 to 25, inclusive; on page 32, lines 1 to 25, inclusive; and lines 1 to 9, inclusive, on page 33.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this is another perfecting amendment. This in effect returns the bill to the present law, as it is now, with respect to appeals from the orders of the Housing Expediter concerning local board decisions. The present law provides that if the Housing Expediter does not approve a recommendation of the local board within 30 days after the receipt of it he shall file with the Emergency Court of Appeals the papers, and the appeal is perfected immediately. Under the proposed bill if the Housing Expediter fails either to approve or disapprove, the local board may file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals. This amendment is not too critical or too important, but it does point out definitely what was meant by those people who said that they were trying to strengthen rent control. In other words, instead of requiring an appeal or requiring the Housing Expediter to definitely file the appeal with the Emergency Court of Appeals, it now leaves it with the local board.

You know after all the greatest statistics are public opinion, and public opinion has been displayed here this afternoon in the attitude of the House toward rent control. I want to read to you what appeared in our committee in the hearings in the form of a news column by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. This news column appeared in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, February 17, 1949. She said:

> Judging from the letters I have been getting from owners of real estate, there is a widespread feeling in this country that the present law under which rents are controlled is not fair to the owner. This would seem to indicate that from the point of view of the owner it is essential that we have a complete review of rent controls that are to be imposed. It is only fair that property owners get a reasonable return on the money invested.

Now, that is one person's idea.

I want to give you another group of statistics. In 1940 there were 16,000,000 rental units in the United States. In 1948 there were only 15,000,000 rental units, and during the time between 1946 and 1948 there were 2,500,000 housing units constructed. So instead of rent control providing new and additional units, rent control is restricting and contracting rental units. I want to leave one other figure with you. Twenty-two percent to 24 percent of the income of all families was used for rent prior to rent control. All families now pay about 12 percent of their budget for rent. The point I am making is that now is not the time to impose greater restrictions. Now is the time to loosen it. Now is the time to think about decontrol when conditions are such that we do not know where we are going in the economic picture. Now is the time to loosen rent control. So I have offered this amendment along with the others in order that we return this bill to the present law with reference to appeals. That the Housing Expediter shall file with the Emergency Court of Appeals any order or regulation he may make with respect to the local board's recommendation instead of permitting the local board, if they so desire, to file.

One reason why that should be done is in discussing recontrol of decontrolled areas you will recall that it was said the Housing Expediter might not recontrol an area which had been decontrolled by order of the court of appeals. He may recontrol any area which had been decontrolled by the local board. Under the law as proposed by this bill every local board must appeal whether they are satisfied or not in order to prevent the

Housing Expediter from recontrolling that area which had been decontrolled. So I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I object. I have other amendments to offer.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the chairman amend his request to apply to this amendment and not to this section?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, how many amendments are at the Clerk's desk?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments that are not at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. There are four amendments at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes which would give 10 minutes to each amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Reserving the right to object, how many amendments are there at the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. There are four amendments at the desk.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I have two others, Mr. Chairman. I am constrained to object. I do object.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, close in 50 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman's motion relates to this section. Is that section 203 or 204?

The CHAIRMAN. Section 203.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is another one of those innocent, perfecting amendments that seeks to do no more than destroy the bill.

There was very little said by the gentleman from Kansas who offered the amendment to explain it. He did give you a lot of statistics that he says apply to the over-all situation of rent control. Let me in answer to that direct your attention to this very vital statistic: This is made much of by the real property owners of the country. The statement is attributed to the chairman of the Construction Industry Information Committee of the building industry of the country. He says that there are nearly 7,000,000 more nonfarm home owners in the United States than before the war, an increase of 60 percent.

Then he quotes from the Bureau of the Census to the effect that in April 1948 there were 17,025,000 nonfarm dwellings occupied by their owners, compared with only 11,000,000 in 1940. The number has increased by almost a million and a quarter in 1948.

Those who are opposed to rent control, because they contend it is stopping construction and not giving the tenant a chance to get a home of his own, are very wrong.

Now, with reference to this particular amendment: This amendment will strike out of the law a provision which requires the Housing Expediter to file his record with the Emergency Court of Appeals so that it may be reviewed in the event the Expediter has disagreed with a local board, either by disapproving or by failing to approve its recommendations for either a general increase in the area or decontrol in the area. This provision as it is in the bill, and as it will remain in the bill if you vote down this amendment, will permit the local board to file its complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals and there get a complete and expeditious review of the local board's recommendation.

I urge you to vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is on the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 28, line 22, strike out the period after the word "title" and insert a semicolon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That the landlord certifies that he is maintaining all services furnished on the maximum rent date, and that he will continue to maintain such services so long as the adjustment in such maximum rent which may be granted, continues in effect."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have proposed follows that part of the bill which relates to adjustments for purposes of removing hardships and inequities.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear that the chairman of the committee has no objection to the amendment. It is a very just one. I should like to explain it very briefly, if I may.

The purpose of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, is to provide that where a landlord gets relief from the Expediter due to a hardship or an inequity that at the same time he shall agree that he will perform for the tenants all the services, such as periodic painting and decoration, faithfully and honestly that he did perform for them on the date that maximum rents were established, and that it shall not then be necessary for the tenants to go to the Expediter's office to compel the landlord to perform those services. It seems just elemental fairness that when a landlord comes into court he should, as we lawyers say, come into court with clean hands and say he is fully prepared to do all that he is called upon to do by virtue of the laws and regulations as a condition for his getting the relief which he now seeks from the Expediter. That is the only thing this proviso does. I think it is eminently fair. It responds to a very factual need.

Many landlords in my area and other areas of the country have gotten relief under the hardship and inequity provision, but with some landlords the tenants, in order to get their apartments looked after in accordance with the regulations and the law, have had to start new proceedings before the Expediter. That has done two things: First, it has put on the tenants a very real burden which they should not necessarily have to carry; and, second it has given the Expediter's office a great deal of added work.

I should like to point out, too, the fairness of this amendment when considered in terms of the Expediter's regulations which provide that where money is spent for painting and decoration, plumbing, repairs, these expenses may be included in the application for the rent increase under the hardship and inequity provision, as amended. It seems only fair that the whole of the issues, both for the landlord and tenant should be cared for at one and the same time. It can be done by this amendment, to which the chairman of the legislative committee has stated he has no objection.

I hope the Committee will see fit to adopt the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE of South Dakota) there were—ayes 105, noes 24.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard all of the debate on this rent-control proposal. In previous sessions of the Congress I have supported rent control.

There are some questions that arise in my mind today that I would like to call your attention to and I would like to get one or two answers from those in charge of this bill.

First, is the District of Columbia included within the coverage of this bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The answer is "No."

Mr. KEEFE. Then we as a legislature have to legislate for the District of Columbia and adopt a separate rent-control law for the District of Columbia. That is true, is it not?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may say in answer to the gentleman's question——

Mr. KEEFE. I do not want any long answer. The gentleman can answer "Yes" or "No." I want it for the record, that is all. I know what the answer is myself, I am not that dumb, but I want it for the record.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does the gentleman want an answer?

Mr. KEEFE. What I stated is true, is it not? If the gentleman can say "No," say so.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The District Committee has recommended a rent-control bill and it was to be presented this week, but will be presented later.

Mr. KEEFE. We understand that. They have recommended a District rent-control bill, of course, and we have a District rent-control bill in the District of Columbia that has its own separate provisions recommended to this Congress by the Committee on the District of Columbia, not the Committee on Banking and Currency. Now, when they recommend that bill to the Congress and we as Members of Congress pass on that bill, we are acting exactly as a State legislature would act for any State.

The chairman of this committee has talked about a national pattern and that we must continue to have a national pattern, otherwise we would have chaos and confusion. That is what he said. The fact of the matter is we have a national pattern but it does not apply to the District of Columbia because we have seen fit to enact separate, specific legislation, for the District of Columbia.

Why is it, may I ask, that we thus legislate? I will answer that, because I have discussed it with the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia and with people connected with the Government of the District of Columbia. We have a model rent-control law in the District of Columbia. We have a magnificent administration of that law. The people here do not want to come under this general pattern. The people of the District of Columbia want their own rent-control law and we as the legislature for the District of Columbia give it to them in the shape of a special piece of legislation.

Now, then, I am asking you of faint heart what is wrong with permitting my State and the legislature of my State to do for the people of Wisconsin exactly what we are doing for the people of the District of Columbia?

We have a rent-control law in my State. The legislature is in session. They are waiting out there now to find out what you propose to do in this matter. We can handle the situation in my State and you can do it in yours, just as we as legislators for the District of Columbia are doing it for the people of the District of Columbia.

I am astounded that some people of intelligence cannot see that particular point. The fact of the matter is the District rent-control law is going to expire on March 31. The next day on which District of Columbia business may be considered is March 28.

What are you going to do about it? What are you going to do about rent control under this great national pattern for the District of Columbia, may I ask? Where are all these crocodile tears that are being shed for the people in Chicago and Pittsburgh and New York and Los Angeles? What are you going to do to protect the people in the District of Columbia, may I ask? You will not be able to do it in the 2 days and get that bill through the House and the Senate and make it law. There will not be any confusion if we turn this whole problem to the States; and if the legislature of any State enacts State rent control, then the Federal act will not apply.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Kansas: Page 29, strike out lines 1 to 23, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) In any case in which a landlord and tenant, on or before December 31, 1947, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection as then in effect, voluntarily entered into a valid written lease in good faith with respect to any housing accommodations, such housing accommodations shall not be subject to any maximum rent established or maintained under the provisions of this title.

"(3) In any case in which a landlord and tenant (including any new tenant) on or before December 31, 1948, voluntarily enter into a valid written lease in good faith (at any rental agreed upon in the lease, but not in excess of 15 percent over the maximum rent which in the absence of a lease would be in effect with respect thereto on the date of enactment of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948) with respect to any housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is in effect under this section, and such lease takes effect on or after the effective date of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 and expires on or after December 31, 1949, and if a true and duly executed copy of such lease is filed, within 15 days after the date of execution of such lease, with the Housing Expediter, such housing accommodations shall not be subject to any maximum rent established or maintained under the provisions of this title."

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, you will recall that with the Housing Act of 1947, and the act of 1948, this Congress provided for voluntary-lease agreements which might be signed by the landlord and the tenant. Those lease agreements provided that they might run for 1 year with a maximum increase in rental of not to exceed 15 percent. The present proposed law repeals that section and does not permit the landlord and the tenant to enter into these voluntary agreements. It is my idea, again, to call this to the attention of the House in order that you might know in what fashion we are strengthening rent control instead of loosening it. It may seem to some of you that my efforts here are a little futile, but I want to remind you that two amendments which I proposed to the committee have been adopted in this bill, so I do not feel so bad about it. Nevertheless, I think this is an important amendment. It is an amendment by which this Congress may present to the people of this country a proposition that a landlord and a tenant, as friends, might sit down together and determine how they might get together and agree upon a proper rental. The proposed law eliminates these leases and recontrols those units which this Congress promised would be decontrolled under the law of 1947.

Mr. Woods, in testifying before our committee, said that the voluntary-lease agreement was not necessary. He said it was based upon an assumption that rent control would be terminated, and gave the tenants the right to bargain for security with their landlords. He said that under the proposed law we would have 2 years of rent control, and in parentheses I say that it is quite possible we will have a permanent rent control if we continue it for 15 months or 2 years; but he said that we are continuing rent control for 2 years and, therefore, we do not need the present voluntary provision.

I believe it would be a healthy and proper thing if we permit the landlord and tenant to once again assume the relationship of neighbors, that they can agree one with the other that they might have a proper rental, that the landlord can go to the tenant and say, "I have had increased costs. I want to redecorate the apartment. I want to do this for you." The tenant then would have the opportunity to sign a lease and secure advantage of these benefits.

So again I offer a perfecting amendment, and suggest that we return the bill to the present law insofar as practicable.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, this would decontrol about 2,500,000 units and would weaken the rent-control law very materially. I hope it will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE of Kansas) there were—ayes 55, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 29, line 11, after "any housing accommodations" insert "including housing accommodations in hotels."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to clarify an ambiguity in the act which exists at the present time and to afford relief to a large class of tenants now unfairly discriminated against. In view of the attitude and sentiment of the House as expressed in this last vote, I think this amendment is particularly appropriate.

Under the so-called Rains amendment which was adopted last week the provisions of section 201 (a) (1) of this act are as they were in the old rent-control law, to the effect that any accommodations in hotels are not subject to control. My amendment would place controls upon and protect hotel tenants who in good faith signed leases with their landlords. Many of us conducted our fight last week to retain controls on permanent housing accommodations in residential hotels and permanent accommodations in other hotels. We believe they should be controlled. My amendment is not directed to transient hotels or transient accommodations of any type. It is not directed to resort hotels. It is not directed even to semitransient accommodations under any circumstances. This amendment is directed only to the return of controls to accommodations for which tenants entered into leases, leases which usually have extended from August of 1947 until December of 1948, under the terms of which in exchange for a 15-percent rent increase the tenant was given a lease. The Rains amendment re-

moves controls from the accommodations even of these permanent tenants and works a distinct hardship upon them. The people affected by the amendment, the tenants of apartment hotels, are not different from people living in other quarters. It is a misconception to assert that only the rich live in these hotels. Stenographers, school teachers, retired civil servants, pensioners, comprise the bulk of residential hotel tenants. They can afford rent increases no more than any other member of the middle class and they should be given the protection of the rent law.

Why should these people be singled out? Why should their accommodations be singled out? They pay for extra service now, even for services which they do not receive. Linen service is infrequent, bellboys have been discharged, their quarters are in disrepair—they must remain because they have no place to move.

The point I should like to make is that the accommodations in these hotels are no different than accommodations in other permanent accommodations for which leases were given. Permanent accommodations in hotels are the same as accommodations in apartment buildings. They should be controlled. My amendment will clarify the act and will place permanent hotel quarters on a par with all other types of accommodations for which leases were entered into.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Would the gentleman explain exactly what this proposed amendment does? Does it nullify what the House did a few days ago in removing the decontrol provision for residential hotels?

Mr. YATES. It does not nullify the action of the House of a few days ago, except for permanent accommodations in hotels. The action of the House of a few days ago, looked to the decontrol of all accommodations within hotels, without drawing any distinction between residential hotels, semitransient hotels, and transient hotels. I understood the intention of that amendment to be directed against living quarters of a purely transsient type and not dedicated to the type of accommodations which were permanent in their nature.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The so-called Rains amendment adopted by the committee on Friday left the law exactly as it is now written.

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does this proposal change that situation any?

Mr. YATES. This proposal changes that situation only in one respect. It changes it only with respect to permanent accommodations for which a lease was given.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There were no leases of the accommodations which had been controlled under the language of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 and 1948. The action taken by the committee last week will restore the language in respect to hotels to what it is at the present time. If the gentleman will look under definitions he will find housing accommodations defined and it does not include those accommodations in hotels which are giving ordinary hotel services. It does not make any difference whether a lease was entered into in respect to accommodations in any kind of a hotel which gave those services because they are not under the bill anyway. I think if we adopted your amendment, we would merely add to the confusion as to what our intent was with respect to hotels.

Mr. YATES. That is not true. If the gentleman will read section 3, on page 29, he will find:

> In any case in which a valid written lease with respect to any housing accommodations was entered into and filed in accordance with the provisions of this subsection (b) as then in effect, and such lease has heretofore terminated or expired or hereafter terminates or expires, such housing accommodations shall be subject to the provisions of this title.

What my amendment does is to extend to permanent accommodations of hotels the same rights for comparable tenants as is accorded to tenants who are not living in apartment-hotels, who live in accommodations now recognized as requiring control, such as ordinary apartment buildings.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman will look at section 202 of the existing law, he will find the definition of a housing accommodation and controlled housing accommodations. The housing accommodations referred to in this section do not include those accommodations in hotels where the hotel services are given so the Expediter or anyone else would not have any interest in leases on those accommodations except——

Mr. YATES. Except—if the gentleman will permit me, if he will read the proposed section 3 on page 29, he will see that this section applies to any housing accommodation where there has been a lease, and it makes no reference to controlled housing accommodations or any other kind of accommodations. That is why I say that the law in this respect is now ambiguous. I think it should include permanent housing accommodations in hotels as well.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The term "housing accommodation" is defined in the act. Any housing accommodation cannot refer to anything but the housing accommodation referred to in the act.

Mr. YATES. That is correct. That is why I think this section is ambiguous and that my amendment will do much to clear up the ambiguity and at the same time afford relief where relief is needed—to tenants of permanent accommodations in residential hotels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

THREE MINUTES ON THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in the 3 minutes permitted, I will attempt to give my view on the continuation of the Marshall plan.

Under it, we gave billions upon billions of dollars in an effort to stop communism and get the western countries of Europe back on their feet.

The theory was that, by the building up of the industries of western Europe, furnishing seed and fertilizer, people in those countries who were in need of food, of clothing, of housing, and of all of the things that folks must have if they are to be happy, contented, and prosperous—those countries would eventually become a barrier against any aggression planned by Russia.

Unfortunately, as some of us predicted, much of the billions of dollars advanced by this Government was wasted.

Instead of the United States handling the money and insisting that the people be fed, clothed, and housed—seed, tools, and fertilizer furnished the farmers; instead of rebuilding the industries of those countries, we turned the money over in lump sums to foreign governments and they, in turn, let altogether too much of it get into the hands of racketeers, profiteers, black-market operators.

Again, instead of building up industries in western Germany, we let France and Great Britain dismantle those industries, take out the machinery, and move it to other places. We permitted Russia to do the same thing in eastern Germany.

However, with our aid, some of the peoples of western Europe are getting back on their feet and we should help them all we can.

But now, instead of continuing to use our dollars to restore their factories and to help them to help themselves, there is substantial evidence that the plan, and the money appropriated, are being used to furnish a market in Europe for American products.

There are many indications that, as prices here recede and evidence of unemployment develops, efforts will be made to appropriate billions more, ostensibly to continue to fight Communists, to provide a barrier against Russia, but, in reality, to supply the funds to purchase farm surplus and the products of our factories, and ship them abroad.

In short, to make Europe a dumping ground for all sorts of surplus as created by the payment of subsidies, for the benefit of certain American interests and in violation of the over-all purpose of the Marshall plan.

Putting it in a different way, there is evidence that Mr. Truman and his administration, faced with the results of excessive taxation, excessive spending, and fearing that there may be a depression and unemployment here, are now endeavoring to lift themselves out of the mess by their own bootstraps—that is, by taxing Americans, giving the money to other nations, with a promise from them that they will spend it for American goods.

Sounds fine, but there is no real merit in it.

That program should not be, for there is no more sense to that idea than there

would be for you, if you were a storekeeper or a farmer, to give me a hundred dollars on my promise to buy what you had to sell. You would get your money back, but you would be giving away your goods instead of selling me something.

With the right kind of help, the Germans and the peoples of other lands willl be back on their feet, but under no circumstances should we establish a worldwide WPA.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I distinctly remember the dire predictions which were made as to what would happen when we voted to terminate OPA and price control. When price control ended, prices zoomed up. Last fall the voters, and I included, were wondering if we had made a mistake, but prices leveled off and we know now that it was no mistake. If we terminate control, rents will go up, and necessarily so, because there are people who are being forced to rent their properties for less than the cost of operation and upkeep. Of course, there will be some suffering, but I have faith in the ability and the industry of the American people to work themselves out of any difficulty if given half a chance.

I sincerely regret that I cannot go along with the leadership of my party on this bill. But this raises a fundamental issue and I would not be true to myself if I did not vote my convictions. I do not believe in the confiscation of the property of one class of citizens in peacetime to serve—or to protect, if you please—another class of citizens, no matter how desirable. If the Eightieth Congress deserves the title of being the worst in history, it is because the majority Members who were then in control did not have the courage to end rent control when they had the power.

If you extend this bill now for 15 months, you might just as well extend it for another 2 years, because at the end of the 15 months, just before the 1950 primaries, you will vote to extend it again or the voters who are benefiting by this arrangement will cut your throats at the election.

I would like to read excerpts from a little article I read some weeks ago entitled "Equality Before the Law?":

EQUALITY BEFORE THE LAW?

What we call Americanism is based on the precept that all citizens stand equal before the law, equal in rights and equal in responsibilities.

Are we drifting away—or being led away—from this important, fundamental concept?

We will look at two citizens—any two citizens, from anywhere. These two citizens have worked hard, achieved a competency and made investments which they hope will bring them security. One invests in a farm and becomes a farmer; the other invests in houses, or an apartment house, and becomes a landlord. Both are prepared to serve the public in an honorable way, one with food, the other with shelter. They stand equal before the law.

But right here an incredible thing happens. The Government, though in honor bound to afford these men equal privilege and opportunity, suddenly begins using its vast powers to help and reward the farmer and to hinder and punish the landlord. Here is the record:

To the farmer parity is guaranteed; to the landlord parity is denied.

To the farmer direct subsidies bring high prices; to the landlord rentals are frozen at low, prewar levels.

The farmer is applauded and his prices skyrocket—often with the direct aid of Government buying—far above parity rates; the landlord is fined and even imprisoned if he accepts any raise in rental, even by agreement with the tenant.

The farmer, grown prosperous out of subsidies paid by all the rest of us, is hailed by the Government as a patriot and a hero; the landlord is denounced by the Government as avaricious and greedy and the tool of special interests if he protests and asks for relief to meet higher taxes and increased operating costs.

These two men, who might be you and I, are not equal before the law. If the Government can do this to them it can do it to us.

* * * * *

As long as these conditions continue, something valuable is slipping away from us, day by day. It is our equality before the law.

I say with regret that I cannot go along with the leaders of my party, but this is a fundamental issue that faces us today, just as fundamental as it was when it faced us a year ago. As has been stated on this floor, if rent control ends many properties will come out from hiding and many more houses will be built by private capital. I may be wrong about it, but I think rent control is the one thing that is keeping capital from being invested in housing. True, new construction is not under rent control, but so long as the rent-control system exists they may sooner or later be put under rent control. It is not fair to have one class under rent control, and another class free from it in the same locality. My opinion is it should be ended now. As someone has said, "don't extend it, don't amend it, you can't defend it, end it."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House should be, if properly titled "A bill to guarantee more slums and reduce employment," for that is exactly what it will do. True, it will create 600 jobs at good pay for local rent-control expediters; and, of course, each one of these 600 little dictators will need at least one assistant expediter and an office force of several people in addition to the present staff, all at the taxpayers' expense. To do what? To ride herd on good Americans, the proprietors and the tenants.

Let us look at this thing squarely and see just who will be hurt most if this bill is made law: the laboring men of America—carpenters, bricklayers, plasterers, painters, paperhangers, plumbers, and material suppliers of every kind; because the property owners cannot and will not spend money for remodeling and repairing. Because of this, additional hundreds of thousands of building mechanics will suffer by being forced to lay idle; the businessman will lose the trade, and our whole national economy will greatly suffer right at a time when unemployment rolls are mounting and business is falling off all over the country.

I ask, Mr. Chairman: What will it profit a laboring man to have a little cheaper rent if he has no earnings with which to pay rent or living costs? That is what the folks who labor are worrying about today, and make no mistake about it.

So, those who would force the property owners of America to take the rent rate which one man in each area dictates he must accept—or else—had best be thinking of the thousands upon thousands of good Americans who will suffer if the rent-control law is extended.

Mr. Chairman, America must not and will not follow in the footsteps of France, which still has her World War I rent-control law in effect. Today France is known as a nation of slums and unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, it is crystal clear by now that the bigwigs who dictate the policy of the party in power are determined to drive investment capital out of existence regardless of whom it hurts or how it affects labor or business or the prosperity and the security of the Nation. That program in time will also destroy their party, not save it, and that is a certainty.

I cannot believe that any Member of Congress would wittingly lend his or her support to any bill that it would appear might save or destroy any political party at the expense and detriment of the general welfare and the preservation of our priceless liberties.

Mr. Chairman, in my studied opinion, we should let rent control die the natural death it deserves.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleague from Iowa has made a dire forecast of unemployment and an economic depression.

My Republican predecessor immediately prior to his departure from Washington made an announcement, which was published in the newspapers, forecasting that an economic depression would descend upon our country not later than March 1 of this year. He further stated that he would be a candidate for reelection in the year 1950 to save our country from the economic collapse which, he stated, would surely result from the last election of a Democratic Congress. I have diligently attended all meetings of this illustrious body of lawmakers and day after day devoted careful attention and consideration to the frequent speeches of complaining defense of the Eightieth Congress made by our Republican Members on the left of this House. I am convinced that the Shakespearean quotation, "Me thinketh the lady protesteth too much," is an applicable theory of the guilt of the indictment presented against the Eightieth Republican Congress by our President during the last election campaign. However, I am fascinated by the clever

strategy adopted by the Republican Members of this House in first maneuvering by amendments, and by unanimously joining a few of the unsuspecting Democratic Members into a proposed defeat of progressive legislation so essential to the general welfare of the people of our great country.

Yes; the Republican leadership, in premeditated cooperation with the big vested business interests of our country, are attempting to scare the people into a false and jittery sense of economic depression and insecurity of the future, and the powerful subsidized Republican newspapers and the hired columnists and commentators, who have no more respect for the truth and welfare of the people than a rooster has for a marriage license—all embittered by their failure to defeat Democratic candidates at the last election—are striving to create confusion and sell the economic and prosperous condition of our great country short, and to rule or ruin, if necessary, to protect their selfish pride and partisan interests, and to defeat the legislative program which the people of our country voted for at the last election. For example, I quote from an article by David Lawrence, published March 14, as follows:

> The Truman depression is here. Despite all the efforts of the administration to minimize it, camouflage it, and deny its existence, the fact remains that an economic readjustment of as yet undetermined proportions is in evidence and has been developing ever since the election last autumn.

Such poppycock articles are purely big-business Republican propaganda, published to discourage the Eighty-first Congress.

The real-estate lobby and vested real-estate interests are actively using the economic depression threat to defeat the proposed legislation now pending before the House. The time is ripe—rotten ripe—for the Democratic Members of this House to stand together and assume our responsibility of passing protective and progressive legislation for the benefit of all the people. If we fail to do so, we may be hereafter known, referred to, and condemned at the next election as the twin brother of the last Eightieth Republican Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 204. (a) Section 205 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out from the heading of such section the words "by tenants"; by inserting after the words "receives such payment", in the first sentence, the following: "(or shall be liable to the United States as hereinafter provided)"; and by changing the period at the end of the second sentence to a colon and inserting: *"Provided,* That if the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, or received either fails to institute an action under this section within 30 days from the date of the occurrence of the violation or is not entitled for any reason to bring the action, the United States may institute such action within such 1-year period. If such action is instituted, the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, or received shall thereafter be barred from bringing an action for the same violation or violations."

(b) The last sentence of section 205 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "plaintiff" and inserting in lieu thereof "person."

SEC. 205. Section 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204, or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of this act, or of any regulation or order or requirement under this act, or to offer, solicit, attempt, or agree to do any of the foregoing.

"(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, the United States may make application to any Federal, State, or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and upon a showing that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

"(c) Any proceeding brought in a Federal court under section 205 or under subsection (b) of this section may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred, or may be brought in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found. Any such court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of any such proceeding brought before it. No costs shall be assessed against the Housing Expediter or the United States Government in any proceeding under this act.

"(d) No person shall be liable for damages or penalties in any Federal, State, or Territorial court, on any grounds for or in respect of anything done or omitted to be done in good faith pursuant to any provision of this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder notwithstanding that subsequently such provision, regulation, order or requirement may be modified, rescinded, or determined to be invalid. The United States may intervene in any suit or action wherein a party relies for ground of relief or defense upon this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder.

"(e) The principal office of the Housing Expediter shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place, and attorneys appointed by the Housing Expediter may, under such authority as may be granted by the Attorney General, appear for and represent the United States in any case arising under this act.

"(f) (1) The Housing Expediter is authorized to make such studies and investigations, to conduct such hearings, and to obtain such information, as he deems necessary or proper to assist him in prescribing any regulation or order under this act, or in the administration and enforcement of this act and regulations and orders prescribed thereunder.

"(2) For the purpose of obtaining information under this subsection, the Housing Expediter is further authorized, by regulation or order, to require any person who rents or offers for rent or acts as broker or agent for the rental of any controlled housing accommodations (A) to furnish information under oath or affirmation or otherwise, (B) to make and keep records and other documents and to make reports, and (C) to permit the inspection and copying of records and other documents and the inspection of controlled housing accommodations.

"(3) For the purpose of obtaining information under this subsection, the Housing Expediter may by subpena require any person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any designated place. Any person subpenaed under this subsection shall have the right to make a record of his testimony and be represented by counsel, and shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the United States district courts. For the purposes of this subsection the Housing Expediter, or any officer or employee under his jurisdiction designated by him, may administer oaths and affirmations.

"(4) The production of a person's documents at any place other than his place of business shall not be required under this subsection in any case in which, prior to the return date specified in the subpena issued with respect thereto, such person either has furnished the Housing Expediter with a copy of such documents (certified by such person under oath to be a true and correct copy), or has entered into a stipulation with the Housing Expediter as to the information contained in such documents.

"(5) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon, any person under this subsection, the United States district court for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the United States, and after notice to such person and hearing, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce documents, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"(6) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or producing documents or from complying with any other requirement under this subsection because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (49 U. S. C. 46), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

"(g) The Housing Expediter shall not publish or disclose any information obtained under this act that such Housing Expediter deems confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless he determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the public interest.

"(h) It shall be unlawful for any person to remove or attempt to remove from any controlled housing accommodations the tenant or occupant thereof or to refuse to renew the lease or agreement for the use of such accommodations, because such tenant or occupant has taken, or proposes to take, action authorized or required by this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder."

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLLINGER: Page 37, strike out, on line 10, all of "(C)", beginning with "any proceeding" and all that follows of the paragraph ending on line 21 with the period mark, and insert in lieu thereof a new paragraph "C", as follows:

"(C) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, and any person who makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be kept or filed under this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both such fines and imprisonment. Whenever the Housing Expediter has reason to believe that any person is liable for punishment under

this subsection, he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

"The district courts shall have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violation of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, and concurrently with State and Territorial courts, of all other proceedings under section 205 and subsection (b) of this section. Such criminal proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Such other proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred, or may be brought in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found. Any such court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of any criminal or other proceedings brought before it under this section. No costs shall be assessed against the Housing Expediter or the United States Government in any proceeding under this act."

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment attempts to put a criminal penalty in this bill for a willful violation. The original bill introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency had this provision in it, and the language I use in my amendment is the identical language. That provision was deleted by a majority vote of the committee. I do not know the real reason for its deletion, but I know if we do not reinstate the language we will in effect be telling the people of the United States that we will permit any unscrupulous landlord who wants to steal money from his tenant, that he can do so; that he has our blessing to commit the crime.

I disagree with many of the Members on this bill, but I do believe that you think you did the right thing when you passed the Brown amendment which gives landlords the right to obtain a reasonable return. If you want to give them the right to a reasonable return and you believe that the people you are giving that right to are honest people who will not take more than they are entitled to, why should we not have this provision in the bill to make certain that some dishonest individuals, against whom civil judgments are worthless, are covered? Why should we not have the right to prosecute them criminally if they violate the law willfully?

In the State of New York, where rent gouging is a crime, cases against landlords have brought shocking practices to light. We have instances where they have given people an apartment on condition that they bought furniture from them, at a price which was exorbitant, or they took money under the table. Are we to say today that we will permit that practice to go on? Why should we be afraid to leave the criminal penalty provision in? I say the honest man is not afraid of that provision. This is our only weapon against the dishonest person who will stoop to any low. It is a hold-up when one resorts to that kind of practice and any hold-up should be prosecuted criminally.

Let us at least put some teeth into the law. The law as it stands before us now is a control without controls. We have given the landlord every kind of a right without regard to the rights of the tenant. Let us be fair to the tenant and give him some protection.

If you adopt this provision you are only hitting at the dishonest man. I think it is our job to make certain that no dishonesty is permitted.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GAMBLE. Does this criminal provision apply against a regulation or just against a law? The gentleman remembers we discussed that in committee.

Mr. DOLLINGER. It provides against the willful violation of the provisions in the act. If the regulation makes reference to that, and if it is willful, it will be covered by this amendment.

Mr. GAMBLE. It would cover a regulation, then?

Mr. DOLLINGER. Yes, if it violates any provision of this act or any regulation or order issued thereunder.

Mr. GAMBLE. By making it apply to regulations as well as to the law, you very much broaden the situation.

Mr. DOLLINGER. There is a 1-year statute of limitations. What would happen prior to 1 year is completely out of that.

Mr. GAMBLE. You do not go back to 1948?

Mr. DOLLINGER. We go back 1 year.

Mr. GAMBLE. Yes, from the date of its enactment.

Mr. DOLLINGER. From the date of its enactment; that is right.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am against placing any Gold Star Mother in jail because she violated some little regulation concerning her own property. That is all I have to say.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 206. Section 209 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 209. Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit speculative or manipulative practices or renting or leasing practices (including practices relating to recovery of the possession) in connection with any controlled housing accommodations, which in his judgment are equivalent to or are likely to result in rent increases inconsistent with the purposes of this act."

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time, not to offer additional perfecting amendments which I have prepared, but rather to point out to the members of this committee what we are doing now in strengthening rent control, even after having adopted the amendments which have been adopted in this body. The rent-control bill as proposed by the majority members of this committee provide for eight additional strengthening and tightening provisions. I merely want to take this opportunity to point out to you what we are doing. First, we are permitting the Housing Expediter to recontrol areas which have been decontrolled. We are permitting him to do that under any circumstance that he may deem advisable. Secondly, we are tightening the appeals from the decisions of the local boards. Third, we are not permitting the landlords and tenants to enter into voluntary agreements. Fourth, under the present law only the tenant or that person involved in dealing with the landlord may now sue the landlord or his agent. Now we permit the United States Government to file suit for treble damages. Fifth, we have what I call the junior G-man clause, not junior Government man, but junior Gestapo man. The junior G-man who will snoop into the business of every individual that the Housing Expediter deems is essential. In this we have a new procedure which provides that the Housing Expediter may issue a subpena to any person—not to any person who offers for lease any property, but he may issue subpenas to any person in the United States and require that person to go any place in the United States to answer that subpena and to bring his books and papers before the Housing Expediter. It has nothing to do with the man who may or may not want to lease his property. Sixth, we have certain specific restrictions under which a man may evict a tenant under present law. Under the proposed law the Housing Expediter may make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to evict or restrict the eviction of tenants. Seventh, the proposed law recontrols converted units which have heretofore been decontrolled. People have spent thousands of dollars remodeling these units. Now we recontrol converted units. Last, but not least, we have done one other thing by recontrolling trailer and trailer space. I understand there is a situation in Connecticut about which somebody came down here to testify. No one else testified about it. But we have recontrolled trailers and trailer space. We have not recontrolled motor courts, but we have recontrolled trailers and trailer space. Absent, very interestingly, is the recontrol of new construction. That is very interesting that no one brought forth before the House an amendment asking for the recontrol of new construction. The obvious reason, of course, is that the majority has realized that controls do restrict production.

Mr. Chairman, because of these unnecessary added restrictions placed in the proposed bill, it is still unpalatable bait to those of us who believe in a return to peacetime economy.

I merely wanted to keep the record straight what we are doing here today. And if you vote for this bill you are voting for these tightened strengthening provisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I wish merely to say to my colleagues that in the House I shall ask for a separate vote on the Rains amendment.

This is the amendment that would operate to continue the decontrol of apartment and residential hotels.

The original Spence bill had a provision for the recontrol of permanent housing accommodations in all hotels. I think this is as it should be since there is no real difference between a permanent home whether it is in a cottage or in a room in a hotel—the test is whether the residence therein is on a permanent basis.

The committee, however, amended the original Spence bill to decontrol transient hotels as differentiated from residential or apartment hotels. That would return permanent housing accommodations in residential or apartment hotels to the protection of rent control.

If the Rains amendment—which leaves all hotels out of adequate control, exactly as at present—is defeated, the original Spence bill as amended by the committee will stand. That is, residential and apartment hotels will be back under rent control, where by all that is just and that is necessary they should be.

There is much real suffering—cruel and unnecessary suffering—being endured by the permanent tenants in apartment and residential hotels. They are people in modest circumstances. My mail is filled with letters from them asking that we in this Congress remember that in November we looked to them and that we do have an obligation not to desert them in their time of great trial.

I sincerely hope my colleagues on both sides of the Chamber will join in defeating the Rains amendment. There should be no partisan approach in the matter of giving relief where it is neded—no partisan division in applying a remedy to good citizens from intolerable conditions.

The sorry plight of tenants of so-called apartment and residential hotels—the victims in many cases of the extremes in gouging, all occasioned by the decontrolling features of the present law, which will be continued under the Rains amendment—is by no means confined to my district.

The district on the north side of Chicago represented by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois, Judge JONAS, a Republican Member of this House, is suffering in exactly the same way. In order that my colleagues may have an accurate picture of what the situation is in Chicago from representatives of both parties, I will be very happy to yield some of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, my colleague, Judge JONAS.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I come from a district where the greater portion of the territory is inhabited by people who live in many residential hotels and apartment hotels. As I understand the bill now, everybody has been exempted from control, including transient hotels, residential hotels, and apartment hotels, and the only person that is left to be controlled is the man who owns an apartment building consisting of two flats or four flats or whatever it may be. That is the final climax of all this legislation.

There are about 30 hotels in my district on the north side of the city of Chicago which were residential hotels until they were decontrolled. They had tenants who had lived there 8 or 9 years. They had leases beginning with 2 or 3 years, then down to 1 year, and then finally they were denied leases at all. They were put on a 30-day basis and now they have no leases at all. Those are the people who have been the victims of this rent gouging. There are about 40 hotels on the north side of the city of Chicago which receive no protection under this bill.

I endorse the effort of my distinguished colleague in this House.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. My distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] tells me that the situation in Kansas City is exactly as it is in Chicago, as I am informed it is in New York, and as the gentlewoman from California assures me it is in Los Angeles. It is really a serious problem in the large places of America, and is unjustly affecting a very fine segment of our population: school teachers, professional people, retired municipal and other public employees living on pensions, widows, men, and women on modest salaries. Corporation Counsel Adamowski, in his letter to me, which is in the printed record of our committee hearings, says that they pay—or did pay before the decontrol provision of the present law—an average of about $10 or $15 a week rent. I do hope that this presentment will reach the understanding of my colleagues and that those of us from the urban centers will have the support and understanding of our good neighbors of both parties in defeating the Rains amendment when the House reconvenes.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAGNER: Page 41, line 8, insert "(a)" before "Whenever", and after line 16, insert the following:

"(b) Notwithstanding the fourth sentence of section 502 (b) of the Housing Act of 1948, the Public Housing Administration, or any State or local public agency administering a low-rent housing project assisted pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937 or title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, shall not have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations operated by it if in the opinion of the administering authority such action or proceeding would result in undue hardship for the occupants of such housing accommodations, or unless in the opinion of such authority other housing facilities are available for such occupants."

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, I shall not seek to address myself to either side, because I think this is a problem in which both sides of the House should be interested.

My amendment, in plain words, deals with so-called over-income families in the public-housing projects. As far as I am concerned, I think that in normal times housing projects such as these are intended for low-income families whose incomes are so low that private enterprise cannot properly house them in other existing or new housing. In normal times I am for requiring families whose income exceeds the established limits being forced to move, without exception. This has been the policy of the public-housing authorities and would, I am sure, continue to be, except for the extreme shortage of housing in which we have found ourselves for a long period of time. So, as long as this critical shortage exists I believe the local public-housing authorities should have discretion in order that they may not have to force families out in cases where it would cause great hardship to force them to move back into the slum areas. This is particularly harsh in the cases of the veterans whose families moved into these housing projects. The boys have come home and now because of some slight increase in income they would be forced to move out. Back in my home district we have approximately 1,007 of these so-called over-income families. Of this number over 70 percent earn incomes of less than $3,000. Fifty-four percent of the so-called over-income families are headed by veterans. It has been the policy in the past that when a person reached an over-income stage he was given a notice to move. I am in favor of that policy where they can find a place to go; but, Mr. Chairman, I have found in the projects back in my home district that these people are the backbone of the Nation. They are rearing large families. Since they have families and a large number of children, they have no place to go. Evictions will serve no purpose other than to put these families on the streets.

I have been urged to offer this amendment, not only by the Better Housing League of my district, which is a Red Feather, Community Chest organization supported by people of all creeds and of all political beliefs, but by my own city council, which is a bipartisan council. They have urged that the Congress give the Housing Authority some discretion to let these people remain in the project until they have some place to go to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. May I commend the gentleman on his statement. Although during normal times I believe that over-income tenants should make way for those whose incomes come within the limitation, I am very much in favor of this amendment. In my own district in Bridgeport, Norwalk, Stamford, and Stratford there are Federal public housing projects in which there are people living who have no place to go if they are evicted. Many of these people would suffer great hardship if evicted. Furthermore, the cost of living has risen so substantially since these maximum incomes were first fixed that the present maximum income rate is completely unrealistic. I shall vote for the gentleman's amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

In closing I may say there are housing units available in my district if you are able to pay $125, $150, or $175 a month rent. Men with an income of less than $3,000 and raising a large family, such as these people are doing, cannot pay these rentals.

The Housing Authority, in which I have a lot of confidence, should be given

some discretion in cases where it will cause undue hardship. I think my amendment is a good one, and I ask the support of my colleagues on both sides of the House for it.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my district we have 390 low-income rental units and up to this very moment over 200 of the families living in those units have received notice that they must vacate or that they must be out before April 1.

We have a very serious housing shortage. The housing shortage that has been so graphically presented to this House by the majority leader and other Members is very acute in my district. If the eviction of these families is carried out it is not going to help the housing situation, but, on the contrary, is going to make it more acute. Therefore, I favor the pending amendment, and I do implore the members of the committee who are advocating the passage of this bill not to be like the immortal 300 Spartans at Thermopylae or like the heroic French in the First World War at Verdun. They were defending the passes against their country's enemies. We who are here trying to pass along our opinions and amendments are the friends of the committee; we are not the enemies of our country at all, and we are sincere about this matter. I do implore the members of the committee to be lenient in this matter and consider the plight of Members who come from districts that have many of these low-rental units and who are faced with this problem. A man who earns $10,000 a year, as compared with a man who may earn $2,000, is not passed over by the housing shortage. When you talk about the housing shortage the family in the higher-income bracket is in need of a roof over its head just as much as the family in the lower-income bracket.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is it not the purpose of this amendment to permit an orderly and temperate relocation of excess-income families within housing projects, a procedure which cannot be undertaken under Public Law 901, which is presently in existence, and which compels the eviction of a family whose income exceeds the limitation of the Housing Act? For instance, in the city of Chicago there are two housing projects within my own area. The income limitation is $2,600. Families whose gross income exceeds that figure are compelled to move. Will this not permit the Housing Authority discretion which it does not now have?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. The gentleman has precisely stated the purpose of this amendment.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHUDOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been sitting patiently in this hall for the past 3 days listening to threats of chaos and confusion and to so-called perfecting amendments, and after much time and much voting in my opinion we have a perfectly confused rent-control bill.

I want to speak in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. I think that his amendment is the most worth-while amendment offered in the past 3 days. The talk of confusion and chaos is already borne out by what is happening to public housing units in Philadelphia and throughout the country. Gentlemen, this is a writ of possession, and under the present law the housing authorities of the country have no other alternative than to issue these writs of possession to families in subsidized housing projects who are earning over the maximum income allowed under the law. Now, the housing authorities know that these people have no place to go. This morning, coming down from Philadelphia on the train, I ran into the executive director of the Philadelphia housing authority. I told him about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. He agreed that it was absolutely necessary. If we want to stop chaos and confusion, if we want to take care of a condition that presently exists, not something that we think might happen, the only way to do it is to pass the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. Let us prevent these conditions that exist in Philadelphia and other jurisdictions throughout the country where people are being put out on the street daily. As a matter of fact, these two families are already evicted. Where they have gone, I do not know. I have tried to locate one of them which consisted of a husband, wife, and six children, and I am advised that they are living in two rooms because they could not find any other place to live.

This is a present need, and the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

I represent a district in the city of Minneapolis that has an 8-blocks-square Federal Housing project called Sumner Field. At the present time I have on my desk a petition signed by 82 families who are threatened with eviction because they have an income that exceeds the Federal Housing limitation. So I want to join in, for the reason that in the city of Minneapolis we have a housing problem. There is no place for these people to move to when they get the final eviction notice.

These are not spinsters, bachelors, and so forth; these are people in the low-income group with families, and they will find absolutely no place to move to when they are evicted. I think the time has come with the increasing economy that has brought them beyond that limitation that a like increase in the present limitation ought to be granted, so I join in urging the adoption of this amendment to the rent-control bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was never presented to the committee. It may be taken up in the housing bill when it is considered by the committee. It certainly seems to me there is no reason to freeze high-income people in subsidized low-rent housing. I do think the Housing Administration ought to try to secure some other accommodations for them, but certainly we do not want to pass any law that will freeze into these low-rent subsidized housing units people whose income has now gone far beyond the limit.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated. We will take this up in the housing bill when we come to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WAGNER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WAGNER) there were—ayes 47, noes 97.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. Nothing in this act or in the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, shall be construed to require any person to offer any housing accommodations for rent.

SEC. 302. Section 303 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 303. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act, and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 304. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which it is enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute, as amended, for the bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1731) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 138, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Under the rule, any amendments to the amendment may be voted on separately, may they not?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, if now is the proper time I ask for a separate vote on the so-called Williams amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Brown amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the so-called Rains amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, line 18, strike out the quotation marks and, after line 18, insert the following subsection:

"(j) If the legislature or comparable governing body of any State, municipality, county, or other political subdivision declares by resolution that Federal rent control is no longer needed in such State, municipality, county, or political subdivision, and transmits a certified copy of such resolution to the Housing Expediter, the provisions of this title shall be inapplicable to such State, municipality, county, or political subdivision 15 days after such certified copy shall have been mailed by registered mail to the Housing Expediter."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, is it not the rule to vote on these amendments in the order in which they were adopted?

The SPEAKER. It has been the custom to put the question on such amendments in the order in which a separate vote has been demanded. The gentleman from Oklahoma rose first and asked for a separate vote on the so-called Williams amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 227, nays 188, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—227

Abbitt	Cole, N. Y.	Gross
Abernethy	Colmer	Gwinn
Allen, Calif.	Cooley	Hagen
Allen, Ill.	Corbett	Hale
Andersen, H. Carl	Cotton	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Anderson, Calif.	Coudert	Hall, Leonard W.
Andresen, August H.	Cox	Halleck
Angell	Crawford	Hand
Arends	Cunningham	Harden
Auchincloss	Curtis	Hare
Barrett, Wyo.	Dague	Harris
Bates, Mass.	Davis, Ga.	Harrison
Battle	Davis, Wis.	Harvey
Beall	D'Ewart	Hébert
Bennett, Fla.	Dolliver	Herlong
Bennett, Mich.	Dondero	Herter
Bentsen	Doughton	Heselton
Bishop	Durham	Hill
Blackney	Eaton	Hinshaw
Boggs, Del.	Ellsworth	Hoeven
Bolton, Ohio	Elston	Hoffman, Mich.
Bonner	Engel, Mich.	Holmes
Boykin	Engle, Calif.	Hope
Bramblett	Fellows	Horan
Brehm	Fenton	Jackson, Calif.
Brooks	Fernandez	James
Brown, Ohio	Fisher	Jenison
Bryson	Fugate	Jenkins
Burton	Fulton	Jennings
Byrnes, Wis.	Gamble	Jensen
Carlyle	Gary	Johnson
Case, N. J.	Gathings	Jonas
Case, S. Dak.	Gavin	Jones, N. C.
Chatham	Gillette	Judd
Church	Golden	Kean
Clevenger	Goodwin	Kearney
Cole, Kans.	Gossett	Kearns
Keating	Graham	Kearns
Keefe	Nixon	Simpson, Ill.
Kilburn	Norblad	Simpson, Pa.
Kilday	Norrell	Smith, Kans.
Kruse	O'Hara, Minn.	Smith, Va.
Kunkel	Passman	Stanley
Larcade	Patten	Stefan
Latham	Patterson	Stigler
LeCompte	Peterson	Stockman
LeFevre	Pfeiffer, William L.	Taber
Lemke	Phillips, Calif.	Tackett
Lichtenwalter	Phillips, Tenn.	Talle
Lodge	Pickett	Taylor
Lovre	Poage	Teague
Lucas	Potter	Thompson
McConnell	Preston	Thornberry
McCulloch	Rankin	Tollefson
McDonough	Redden	Towe
McGregor	Reed, Ill.	Van Zandt
McMillan, S. C.	Rees	Velde
McMillen, Ill.	Regan	Vorys
Mack, Wash.	Rich	Vursell
Macy	Richards	Wadsworth
Mahon	Riehlman	Weichel
Martin, Iowa	Rivers	Werdel
Martin, Mass.	Rogers, Fla.	Wheeler
Mason	Rogers, Mass.	Whitten
Merrow	Sadlak	Whittington
Meyer	St. George	Wickersham
Michener	Sanborn	Wigglesworth
Miles	Scott, Hardie	Williams
Miller, Md.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Willis
Miller, Nebr.	Scrivner	Wilson, Ind.
Morris	Scudder	Wilson, Okla.
Morton	Secrest	Wilson, Tex.
Murray, Tenn.	Shafer	Winstead
Murray, Wis.	Short	Wolcott
Nelson	Sikes	Wolverton
Nicholson		Woodruff

NAYS—188

Addonizio	Frazier	Morgan
Albert	Furcolo	Morrison
Allen, La.	Garmatz	Moulder
Andrews	Gordon	Multer
Aspinall	Gore	Murdock
Bailey	Gorski Ill.	Murphy
Baring	Gorski, N. Y.	Noland
Barrett, Pa.	Granahan	Norton
Bates, Ky.	Granger	O'Brien, Ill.
Beckworth	Grant	O'Brien, Mich.
Biemiller	Green	O'Hara, Ill.
Bland	Gregory	O'Neill
Boggs, La.	Hardy	O'Sullivan
Bolling	Hart	O'Toole
Bolton, Md.	Havenner	Pace
Bosone	Hays, Ark.	Patman
Breen	Hays, Ohio	Perkins
Brown, Ga.	Hedrick	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Buchanan	Heffernan	Philbin
Buckley, Ill.	Heller	Polk
Buckley, N. Y.	Hobbs	Powell
Burdick	Holifield	Price
Burke	Howell	Priest
Burleson	Huber	Quinn
Burnside	Hull	Rabaut
Byrne, N. Y.	Irving	Rains
Camp	Jackson, Wash.	Ramsay
Canfield	Jacobs	Rhodes
Cannon	Javits	Ribicoff
Carnahan	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Carroll	Jones, Mo.	Rooney
Cavalcante	Karst	Sabath
Chelf	Karsten	Sadowski
Chesney	Kee	Sasscer
Christopher	Kelley	Sheppard
Chudoff	Kennedy	Sims
Clemente	Keogh	Smathers
Coffey	Kerr	Spence
Combs	King	Staggers
Cooper	Kirwan	Steed
Crook	Klein	Sullivan
Crosser	Lane	Sutton
Davenport	Lesinski	Tauriello
Davies, N. Y.	Lind	Thomas, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Linehan	Trimble
Dawson	Lyle	Underwood
Deane	Lynch	Vinson
DeGraffenried	McCarthy	Wagner
Delaney	McCormack	Walsh
Denton	McGrath	Walter
Dingell	McGuire	Welch, Calif.
Dollinger	McKinnon	Welch, Mo.
Donohue	Mack, Ill.	Whitaker
Douglas	Madden	White, Calif.
Doyle	Magee	White, Idaho
Eberharter	Mansfield	Wier
Elliott	Marcantonio	Withrow
Evins	Marsalis	Woodhouse
Fallon	Marshall	Worley
Feighan	Miller, Calif.	Yates
Flood	Mills	Young
Fogarty	Mitchell	Zablocki
Forand	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—18

Barden	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Blatnik	Lanham	Smith, Ohio
Bulwinkle	McSweeney	Smith, Wis.
Celler	O'Konski	Somers
Chiperfield	Plumley	Thomas, N. J.
Gilmer	Poulson	Wood

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Chiperfield for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Somers against.

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. McSweeney against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Wood with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. Lanham with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. PASSMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 22, strike out beginning with the word "In" down through the period in line 25, and insert the following sentences: "In making and recommending individual and general adjustments to remove hardships or to correct other inequities, the Housing Expediter and the local boards shall observe the principle of maintaining maximum rents for controlled-housing accommodations, so far as is practicable, at levels which will yield to landlords a reasonable return (but not in excess of a reasonable return) on the reasonable value of such housing accommodations. In determining whether the maximum rent for controlled-housing accommodations yields a reasonable return on the reasonable value of such housing accommodations, due consideration shall be given to the following, among other relevant factors: (A) Increases in property taxes, (B) unavoidable increases in operating and maintenance expenses, (C) major capital improvement of the housing accommodations as distinguished from ordinary repair, replacement, and maintenance, (D) increases or decreases in living space, services, furniture, furnishings, or equipment, and (E) substantial deterioration of the housing accommodations, other than ordinary wear and tear, or failure to perform ordinary repair, replacement, or maintenance."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Fifty-three Members have arisen, not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 311, noes 47.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 25, lines 18 to 24, inclusive, strike out lines 18 to 24, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA of Illinois) there were—ayes 231, noes 145.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 237, nays 175, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—237

Abbitt	Gary	Morton
Abernethy	Gathings	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Murray, Wis.
Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Nelson
Allen, La.	Golden	Nicholson
Andersen, H. Carl	Goodwin	Nixon
	Gossett	Norblad
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	Norrell
Andresen, August H.	Grant	O'Hara, Minn.
	Gross	Pace
Andrews	Gwinn	Passman
Angell	Hagen	Patterson
Arends	Hale	Peterson
Auchincloss	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Pfeiffer, William L.
Baring		
Barrett, Wyo.	Hall, Leonard W.	Phillips, Calif.
Bates, Mass.		Phillips, Tenn.
Battle	Halleck	Pickett
Beall	Hand	Poage
Bennett, Fla.	Harden	Potter
Bennett, Mich.	Hardy	Preston
Bentsen	Hare	Rains
Bishop	Harris	Rankin
Blackney	Harvey	Redden
Boggs, Del.	Hays, Ark.	Reed, Ill.
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Rees
Bolton, Md.	Herlong	Regan
Bolton, Ohio	Herter	Rich
Boykin	Heselton	Richards
Bramblett	Hill	Riehlman
Brehm	Hinshaw	Rivers
Brooks	Hobbs	Rogers, Fla.
Brown, Ga.	Hoeven	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich.	Sadlak
Bryson	Holmes	St. George
Burton	Hope	Sanborn
Byrnes, Wis.	Horan	Scott, Hardie
Camp	Jackson, Calif.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Carlyle	James	
Case, N. J.	Jenison	Scrivner
Case, S. Dak.	Jenkins	Scudder
Chatham	Jennings	Shafer
Church	Jensen	Short
Clevenger	Johnson	Sikes
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Ala.	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, N. C.	Simpson, Pa.
Colmer	Kean	Smathers
Combs	Kearney	Smith, Kans.
Cooley	Kearns	Smith, Va.
Cooper	Keating	Stanley
Corbett	Keefe	Steed
Cotton	Keogh	Stefan
Coudert	Kilburn	Stockman
Cox	Kilday	Taber
Crawford	Kunkel	Tackett
Cunningham	Larcade	Talle
Curtis	Latham	Taylor
Dague	LeCompte	Teague
Davis, Ga.	LeFevre	Thompson
Davis, Tenn.	Lemke	Thornberry
Davis, Wis.	Lichtenwalter	Tollefson
DeGraffenried	Lodge	Towe
D'Ewart	Lovre	Van Zandt
Dolliver	Lucas	Vorys
Dondero	Lyle	Vursell
Doughton	McConnell	Wadsworth
Durham	McCulloch	Weichel
Eaton	McDonough	Werdel
Elliott	McGregor	Wheeler
Ellsworth	McMillen, Ill.	Whitten
Elston	Mack, Wash.	Whittington
Engel, Mich.	Macy	Wickersham
Engle, Calif.	Martin, Iowa	Wigglesworth
Evins	Martin, Mass.	Williams
Fellows	Mason	Willis
Fenton	Merrow	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Meyer	Wilson, Tex.
Ford	Michener	Winstead
Frazier	Miller, Md.	Wolcott
Fulton	Miller, Nebr.	Wolverton
Gamble	Morrison	Woodruff

NAYS—175

Addonizio	Bland	Burdick
Albert	Bolling	Burke
Aspinall	Bonner	Burleson
Bailey	Bosone	Burnside
Barrett, Pa.	Breen	Byrne, N. Y.
Bates, Ky.	Buchanan	Canfield
Beckworth	Buckley, Ill.	Cannon
Biemiller	Buckley, N. Y.	Carnahan
Carroll	Jackson, Wash.	O'Neill
Cavalcante	Jacobs	O'Sullivan
Chelf	Javits	O'Toole
Chesney	Jonas	Patman
Christopher	Jones, Mo.	Patten
Chudoff	Judd	Perkins
Clemente	Karst	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Coffey	Karsten	
Crook	Kee	Philbin
Crosser	Kelley	Polk
Davenport	Kennedy	Powell
Davies, N. Y.	Kerr	Price
Dawson	King	Quinn
Deane	Kirwan	Rabaut
Delaney	Klein	Ramsay
Denton	Kruse	Rhodes
Dingell	Lane	Ribicoff
Dollinger	Lanham	Rodino
Donohue	Lesinski	Rooney
Douglas	Lind	Sabath
Doyle	Linehan	Sadowski
Eberharter	Lynch	Sasscer
Fallon	McCarthy	Secrest
Feighan	McCormack	Sims
Fernandez	McGrath	Spence
Flood	McGuire	Staggers
Fogarty	McKinnon	Stigler
Forand	Mack, Ill.	Sullivan
Fugate	Madden	Sutton
Furcolo	Magee	Tauriello
Garmatz	Mahon	Thomas, Tex.
Gordon	Mansfield	Trimble
Gore	Marcantonio	Underwood
Gorski, Ill.	Marsalis	Vinson
Gorski, N. Y.	Marshall	Wagner
Granahan	Miles	Walsh
Granger	Miller, Calif.	Walter
Green	Mills	Welch, Calif.
Gregory	Mitchell	Welch, Mo.
Harrison	Monroney	Whitaker
Hart	Morgan	White, Calif.
Havenner	Morris	White, Idaho
Hays, Ohio	Moulder	Wier
Hedrick	Multer	Wilson, Okla.
Heffernan	Murdock	Withrow
Heller	Murphy	Woodhouse
Holifield	Noland	Worley
Howell	Norton	Yates
Huber	O'Brien, Ill.	Young
Hull	O'Brien, Mich.	Zablocki
Irving	O'Hara, Ill.	

NOT VOTING—21

Barden	McMillan, S. C.	Sheppard
Blatnik	McSweeney	Smith, Ohio
Bulwinkle	O'Konski	Smith, Wis.
Celler	Plumley	Somers
Chiperfield	Poulson	Thomas, N. J.
Gilmer	Priest	Velde
Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.	Wood

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Chiperfield for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Somers against.

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. McSweeney against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Wood with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Velde.

Mr. Priest with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT moves that the bill H. R. 1731 be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 25 beginning in line 17, strike out all of titles 2 and 3 of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Title 2, maximum rents: Section 201, subsections (a) and (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, are each amended by striking out 'March 31, 1949', and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1949'."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SPENCE. I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 154, nays 260, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—154

Abernethy	Goodwin	Murray, Wis.
Allen, Calif.	Gossett	Nicholson
Allen, Ill.	Graham	Nixon
Andersen, H. Carl	Gwinn	Norblad
	Hagen	O'Hara, Minn.
Anderson, Calif.	Hale	Peterson
Andresen, August H.	Hall, Leonard W.	Pfeiffer, William L.
		Phillips, Calif.
Angell	Halleck	Phillips, Tenn.
Arends	Harden	Potter
Barrett, Wyo.	Hare	Rankin
Bates, Mass.	Harvey	Reed, Ill.
Beall	Herlong	Rees
Bennett, Mich.	Hill	Rich
Bishop	Hinshaw	Richards
Blackney	Hoeven	Riehlman
Boggs, Del.	Hoffman, Mich.	Rivers
Bolton, Md.	Hope	Rogers, Fla.
Bolton, Ohio	Horan	Rogers, Mass.
Boykin	Jackson, Calif.	Sadlak
Bramblett	James	St. George
Brehm	Jenison	Sanborn
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Bryson	Jennings	
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Scrivner
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson	Scudder
Church	Jonas	Shafer
Clevenger	Kearns	Short
Cole, Kans.	Keefe	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Colmer	Kunkel	Smith, Kans.
Cotton	Latham	Smith, Va.
Cox	LeCompte	Stefan
Crawford	LeFevre	Stockman
Cunningham	Lemke	Taber
Curtis	Lichtenwalter	Talle
Dague	Lovre	Teague
Davis, Ga.	McConnell	Towe
Davis, Wis.	McCulloch	Van Zandt
D'Ewart	McDonough	Velde
Dolliver	McGregor	Vorys
Dondero	McMillan, S. C.	Vursell
Eaton	McMillen, Ill	Wadsworth
Ellsworth	Macy	Weichel
Elston	Martin, Iowa	Werdel
Fellows	Martin, Mass.	Whittington
Fenton	Mason	Wigglesworth
Ford	Merrow	Williams
Gamble	Meyer	Wilson, Ind.
Gathings	Michener	Winstead
Gavin	Miller, Md.	Wolcott
Gillette	Miller, Nebr.	Woodruff
Golden	Murray, Tenn.	

NAYS—260

Abbitt	Bailey	Bentsen
Addonizio	Baring	Biemiller
Albert	Barrett, Pa.	Bland
Allen, La.	Bates, Ky.	Boggs, La.
Andrews	Battle	Bolling
Aspinall	Beckworth	Bonner
Auchincloss	Bennett, Fla.	Bosone

Breen
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.
Burdick
Burke
Burleson
Burnside
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll
Case, N. J.
Cavalcante
Chatham
Chelf
Chesney
Christopher
Chudoff
Clemente
Coffey
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Crook
Crosser
Davenport
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
Dingell
Dollinger
Donohue
Doughton
Douglas
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Fugate
Fulton
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gary
Gordon
Gore
Gorski, Ill.
Gorski, N. Y.
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gross
Hall,
Edwin Arthur
Hand
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Herter
Heselton
Hobbs
Holifield
Holmes
Howell
Huber
Hull
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
Javits
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karst
Karsten
Kean
Kearney
Keating
Kee
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Lesinski
Lind
Lyle
Lynch
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marsalis
Marshall
Miles
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Nelson
Noland
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Pace
Passman
Patman
Patten
Patterson
Perkins
Pfeifer,
Joseph L.
Philbin
Pickett
Poage
Polk
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Redden
Regan
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Rodino
Rooney
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Scott, Hardie
Secrest
Sikes
Sims
Smathers
Spence
Staggers
Stanley
Steed
Stigler
Sullivan
Sutton
Tackett
Tauriello
Taylor
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Underwood
Vinson
Wagner
Walsh
Walter
Welch, Calif.
Welch, Mo.
Wheeler
White, Calif.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Willis
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Withrow
Wolverton
Woodhouse
Worley
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—19

Barden
Blatnik
Bulwinkle
Celler
Chiperfield
Gilmer
Hoffman, Ill.
McSweeney
O'Konski
Plumley
Poulson
Reed, N. Y.
Sheppard
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Somers
Thomas, N. J.
Whitaker
Wood

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Chiperfield for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Somers against.

Mr. O'Konski for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. McSweeney against.

Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Gilmer against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Wood with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on the final passage I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 261, nays 153, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—261

Abbitt
Addonizio
Allen, La.
Andrews
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Biemiller
Bland
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Breen
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.
Burdick
Burke
Burnside
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll
Case, N. J.
Cavalcante
Chelf
Chesney
Christopher
Chudoff
Clemente
Coffey
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Crook
Crosser
Davenport
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
Dingell
Dollinger
Donohue
Douglas
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fenton
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Fugate
Fulton
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gary
Gordon
Gore
Gorski, Ill.
Gorski, N. Y.
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gross
Hall,
Edwin Arthur
Hall,
Leonard W.
Hand
Hardy
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Herter
Heselton
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Holifield
Holmes
Horan
Howell
Huber
Hull
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
James
Javits
Johnson
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karst
Karsten
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilburn
King
Kirwan
Klein
Kruse
Kunkel
Lane
Larcade
Latham
LeFevre
Lesinski
Lichtenwalter
Lind
Linehan
Lodge
Lynch
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McDonough
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Marsalis
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Miles
Miller, Calif.
Mitchell
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Nelson
Nixon
Noland
Norblad
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Pace
Patman
Patten
Patterson
Perkins
Pfeifer,
Joseph L.
Pfeiffer,
William L.
Philbin
Polk
Powell
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Riehlman
Rivers
Rodino
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Sabath
Sadlak
Sadowski
St. George
Sasscer
Scott, Hardie
Scott,
Hugh D., Jr.
Secrest
Sikes
Sims
Smathers
Spence
Staggers
Stigler
Sullivan
Sutton
Talle
Tauriello
Taylor
Thomas, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Underwood
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wagner
Walsh
Walter
Welch, Calif.
Welch, Mo.
White, Calif.
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams
Willis
Withrow
Wolverton
Woodhouse
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—153

Abernethy
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen,
August H.
Angell
Arends
Barrett, Wyo.
Beall
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Boykin
Bramblett
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Case, S. Dak.
Chatham
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Cotton
Cox
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Doughton
Eaton
Ellsworth
Elston
Fellows
Fernandez
Fisher
Ford
Gathings
Gavin
Gillette
Golden
Goodwin
Gossett
Graham
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Halleck
Harden
Hare
Harris
Harrison
Harvey
Herlong
Hill
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Hope
Jackson, Calif.
Jenison
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Keefe
Kilday
Lanham
LeCompte
Lemke
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
McCulloch
McGregor
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
Macy
Mahon
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Nicholson
Norrell
O'Hara, Minn.
Passman
Peterson
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Pickett
Poage
Potter
Preston
Rankin
Redden
Reed, Ill.
Rees
Regan
Rich
Richards
Rogers, Fla.
Sanborn
Scrivner
Scudder
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Stockman
Taber
Tackett
Teague
Thompson
Towe
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
Werdel
Wheeler
White, Idaho
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Woodruff
Worley

NOT VOTING—19

Barden
Blatnik
Bulwinkle
Celler
Chiperfield
Gilmer
Hoffman, Ill.
McSweeney
O'Konski
Plumley
Poulson
Reed, N. Y.
Sheppard
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Somers
Thomas, N. J.
Whitaker
Wood

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

On this vote:

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Chiperfield against.

Mr. Somers for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr. McSweeney for, with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Plumley against.

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Wood against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Barden with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

KEEP THE FARM INCOME AT PARITY! WHEN OUR FARMERS ARE PROSPEROUS AMERICA IS PROSPEROUS; THE NATIONAL INCOME OF THESE UNITED STATES IS ALWAYS SEVEN TIMES THE FARM INCOME

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein the names and addresses of the county and community agricultural program committeemen for each county of my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the basic industry of our country. The men who produce the fat, the food, and the fiber for this Nation are the producers of the indispensables of life.

Mr. Speaker, not alone do all the cities need the products of the farms to sustain life, but we in the cities also need the purchasing power of our farmers in order to keep the wheels of progress going in our city Industries.

Our farmers are entitled to receive for the things which they produce and sell a price commensurate with the cost of the products of industry which they buy. It was to effect such parity of price that the system of appointing farm committees was established.

These agricultural conservation committees, made up entirely of the farmers themselves, are appointed each year locally to administer the affairs of agriculture in their own districts with respect to the statutes and appropriations which we make in this House, both as to soil conservation benefits and such other subsidies as are voted.

Cuyahoga, Lake, and Geauga Counties in my district, the Twenty-second District of Ohio, are rich agricultural producing areas. Happy I am to say that they rank in the front ranks of all such producing areas in the United States.

I have just received a list of the agricultural conservation committees who are to serve this year. That list contains the names of some of the finest people in my district, and it is in order that I may make the complete list of these committees available to the farmers in my district that I ask to insert the same in the RECORD.

The list is as follows:

LIST OF CUYAHOGA COUNTY AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEEMEN, CUYAHOGA, OHIO

COUNTY COMMITTEE

Home address, Cuyahoga County Agricultural Conservation Association, room 203, 1276 West Third Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

Chairman, George W. Nichols, 89 Columbus Road, Bedford, Ohio.

Vice chairman, Joseph R. Shebanek, 1593 Sheffield Road, South Euclid, Ohio.

Member, Helen E. Gedeon, 9600 Ridge Road, Brecksville, Ohio.

Alternate, Lee C. Usher, Usher Road, Olmsted Falls, Ohio.

Alternate, Herman L. Christensen, 2867 Wooster Road, Rocky River, Ohio.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEES

Bedford district

Chairman, George M. Johnston, 1297 Alexander Road, Bedford.

Vice chairman, George L. Laing, Solon Road, Bedford.

Member, Joseph A. Benko, 669 Columbus Road, Bedford.

Alternate, Harold N. Athey, Walton Road, Bedford.

Brecksville district

Chairman, Ralph D. Mackey, 7 Dewey Road, Brecksville.

Vice chairman, Clair H. Bourne, Miller Road, Brecksville.

Member, Bert B. Hinckley, Wiese Road, Brecksville.

Alternate, John L. Schlund, 51 Fitzwater Road, Brecksville.

Alternate, Vera W. McCreery, 76 Mill Road, Brecksville.

Euclid district

Chairman, Albert P. Marous, Wilson Mills Road, South Euclid.

Vice chairman, Harry M. Lockemer, 640 S. O. M. Center Road, Gates Mills.

Member, James W. Vitek, 4839 Anderson Road, South Euclid.

Alternate, John P. Florian, 672 Trebisky Road, South Euclid.

Olmsted district

Chairman, Lee C. Usher, Usher Road, Olmsted Falls.

Vice chairman, David A. Barnard, Cook Road, North Olmsted.

Member, Franklin C. Bislich, Fitch Road, North Olmsted.

Alternate, George Rados, Ruple Road, Berea.

Alternate, Charles W. Stone, Sprague Road, Columbia Station.

Parma district

Chairman, Harold W. Selzer, Pearl Road, Route 1, Berea.

Vice chairman, Andrew H. Rosbough, Engle Road, Berea.

Member, Wilber C. Kaiser, 7261 York Road, Parma.

Alternate, Henry J. Wensink, Hummel Road, Route 3, Berea.

Alternate, Jacob C. Walters, Jr., Engle Road, Berea.

Solon district

Chairman, George J. Craemer, S. O. M. Center Road, Solon.

Vice Chairman, Albert E. Hennig, North Miles Road, Solon.

Member, Norman P. Herbell, Chagrin Falls.

Alternate, Robert L. Stern, Jackson Road, Chagrin Falls.

Alternate, Natt R. Davis, Holbrook Road, Chagrin Falls.

Strongsville district

Chairman, Harvey Uhinck, Howe Road, Brunswick.

Vice chairman, Noris A. Sperber, Drake Road, Strongsville.

Member, Fred W. Grosser, Route 3, Brecksville.

Alternate, Harold S. Jacque, Abbey Road, North Royalton.

Westlake district

Chairman, Herman L. Christensen, 2867 Wooster Road, Rocky River.

Vice chairman, Edward H. Lehman, 25057 Detroit Road, Westlake.

Member, Leonard H. Williams, 28207 Center Ridge Road, Westlake.

Alternate, Allen Deeks, 22591 Center Ridge Road, Westlake.

Alternate, Lawrence G. Borth, 1557 Canterbury Road, Westlake.

LIST OF GEAUGA COUNTY AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEEMEN, GEAUGA, OHIO

COUNTY COMMITTEE

Home address: Geauga County Agricultural Conservation Association, Old School Building, Burton.

Chairman, James D. Sidley, Thompson.

Vice chairman, Clifton Rossiter, Chardon, Route 2.

Member, Harry C. Evans, East Claridon.

Alternate, George C. Bliss, Novelty.

Alternate, Jack F. Kramer, Burton, Route 1.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEES

Auburn community

Chairman, Jack F. Kramer, Burton, Route 1.

Vice chairman, Robert G. Squire, Burton, Route 1.

Member, Lawrence J. May, Chagrin Falls, Route 2.

Alternate, Ernest L. Hall, Mantua.

Alternate, J. Lloyd Squire, Burton, Route 1.

Bainbridge community

Chairman, Cleon C. Taylor, Chagrin Falls, Route 1.

Vice chairman, Frank C. Marcus, Chagrin Falls, Route 2.

Member, Howard S. Taylor, Chagrin Falls, Route 1.

Alternate, Lester R. Haskins, Chagrin Falls, Route 2.

Alternate, Virgil A. Mitchell, Chagrin Falls, Route 1.

Burton community

Chairman, F. Ernest Kibler, Burton, Route 2.

Vice chairman, Burton Fish, Burton, Route 2.

Member, Robert A. Newcomb, Burton, Route 2.

Alternate, Lillian M. Walter, Burton.

Alternate, Frank J. Urbanowicz, Burton, Route 2.

Chardon community

Vice chairman, Ralph P. Dewalt, Chardon, Route 3.

Member, Harry L. Osborn, Chardon, Route 3.

Alternate, Jay M. Sage, Chardon, Route 3.

Alternate, Ernest A. Parker, Chardon, Route 3.

Chester community

Chairman, Raymond A. Craig, Chesterland.

Vice chairman, Charles A. Sweet, Chesterland.

Member, Clay B. Eddy, Chesterland.

Alternate, Lawrence Battles, Chesterland.

Alternate, Robert L. Barnes, Chardon, Route 2.

Claridon community

Chairman, Harlon E. Krum, Huntsburg.

Vice chairman, Bartlett Warner, Huntsburg.

Member, J. Ray Evans, Chardon, Route 1.

Alternate, John T. Rider, Chardon, Route 1.

Alternate, Paul W. McNish, Burton.

Hambden community

Chairman, Fredric C. Zikursh, Chardon, Route 4.

Vice chairman, Charles J. Koritansky, Chardon, Route 4.

Member, Jerry Blasek, Chardon, Route 4.

Alternate, Joe Veverka, Chardon, Route 1.

Alternate, Edward Vanac, Chardon, Route 4.

Huntsburg community

Chairman, Howard O. Barnes, Middlefield.

Vice chairman, Hilda A. Barnes, Middlefield.

Member, John S. White, Huntsburg.

Alternate, Frank H. Adams, Huntsburg.

Alternate, Vaughn Arnold, Huntsburg.

Middlefield community

Chairman, Harry W. Rosengreen, Middlefield.
Vice chairman, Merritt C. Lyman, Middlefield.
Member, Albert F. Faust, Middlefield.
Alternate, Glade R. Hoskins, Middlefield.
Alternate, George H. Stone, Middlefield.

Montville community

Chairman, James D. Sidley, Thompson.
Vice chairman, Marton A. Beardsley, Chardon, Route 4.
Member, Eldon L. Rhodes, Chardon, Route 4.
Alternate, Rudolph F. Meier, Montville.
Alternate, Hugh L. Leggett, Huntsburg.

Munson community

Chairman, Warren W. Arnold, Chardon, Route 2.
Vice chairman, Varon J. Warner, Chardon, Route 2.
Member, Harold L. Sanborn, Chardon, Route 2.
Alternate, Lloyd C. Herrington, Chardon, Route 2.
Alternate, Elmer A. Summers, Chardon, Route 2.

Newbury community

Chairman, Henry Povolny, Barton, Route 1.
Vice chairman, James J. Teichman, Novelty.
Member, Harold B. Thomas, Chardon, Route 2.
Alternate, Frank Sedivy, Novelty.
Alternate, Frederick W. Kleve, Novelty.

Parkman community

Chairman, Frank S. Cone, Middlefield, Route 3.
Vice chairman, Melbourn C. Owen, West Farmington.
Member, Roger M. Hoxter, Parkman.
Alternate, Pete Downs, West Farmington.
Alternate, Victor A. Hosmer, Garrettsville.

Russell community

Chairman, George C. Bliss, Novelty.
Vice chairman, Joe Klouda, Novelty.
Member, Francis H. Newyear, Novelty.
Alternate, Harry P. Modroo, Chagrin Falls.
Alternate, Mathew K. Goesting, Novelty.

Thompson community

Chairman, Paul M. Maier, Madison, Route 2.
Vice chairman, Lawrence Beckel, Thompson.
Member, John F. Strava, Thompson.
Alternate, Roy C. Andrews, Thompson.
Alternate, Paul W. Wilber, Thompson.

Troy community

Chairman, Arthur J. Kimpton, Garrettsville.
Vice chairman, Neil C. White, Burton, Route 2.
Member, Eldon H. Russell, Burton, Route 2.
Alternate, Melvin W. Wood, Burton, Route 2.
Alternate, Benjamin R. Bieger, Burton, Route 2.

LIST OF COUNTY AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEEMEN, LAKE COUNTY, OHIO, 1949

(Lake County Agricultural Conservation Association, 16 North Saint Clair Street, Painesville, Ohio.)

COUNTY COMMITTEE

Chairman, Hermon L. Mantle, Painesville, Ohio.
Vice chairman, Lynn Plaisted, Route 1, Willoughby, Ohio.
Member, H. Russell Adams, Perry, Ohio.
First alternate, Lloyd P. Christian, Perry, Ohio.
Second alternate, Edward H. Bucholtz, Route 3, Painesville, Ohio.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEES

Concord Township

Chairman, Edward H. Bucholtz, Route 3, Painesville, Ohio.
Vice chairman, Ralph D. Webster, Route 3, Painesville, Ohio.
Member, Fred A. Anderson, Route 3, Painesville, Ohio.
Alternate, Charles Hladik, Route 3, Painesville, Ohio.
Alternate, Clifford D. Webster, Route 3, Painesville, Ohio.

Kirtland Township

Chairman, John A. Maier, Route 2, Willoughby, Ohio.
Vice chairman, Samuel B. Schupp, Route 2, Willoughby, Ohio.
Member, James Horner, Route 2, Willoughby, Ohio.
Alternate, Albert H. Mueller, Route 2, Willoughby, Ohio.
Alternate, Harry Silvers, Route 3, Mentor, Ohio.

Leroy Township

Chairman, Carl E. Crellin, Route 2, Painesville, Ohio.
Vice chairman, Edward E. Lajnar, Route 2, Painesville, Ohio.
Member, Frank Berta, Route 2, Painesville, Ohio.
Alternate, Elias N. Harrison, Route 2, Painesville, Ohio.
Alternate, Henry Farnolz, Route 3, Painesville, Ohio.

Madison Township

Chairman, Charles L. Sohn, Route 3, Madison, Ohio.
Vice chairman, Horace C. Fuller, Route 1, Madison, Ohio.
Member, William T. Baster, Madison, Ohio.
Alternate, J. Taylor Baster, Madison, Ohio.
Alternate, Charles A. Greenman, Madison, Ohio.

Mentor Township

Chairman, Horace J. Wilson, Mentor, Ohio.
Vice chairman, Elea E. Shaw, Route 1, Mentor, Ohio.
Member, Charles Robertson, Route 3, Mentor, Ohio.
Alternate, Raymond E. Siegel, Route 2, Mentor, Ohio.
Alternate, E. Murray Kephart, Route 1, Mentor, Ohio.

Painesville Township

Chairman, William A. Youmans, Route 1, Painesville, Ohio.
Vice chairman, Ralph W. Taylor, Rural Delivery, Painesville, Ohio.
Member, Louis T. Curtis, Route 2, Painesville, Ohio.
Alternate, Joseph W. Patterson, Route 2, Painesville, Ohio.
Alternate, Rufus J. Cowle, Route 2, Painesville, Ohio.

Perry Township

Chairman, Lloyd P. Christian, Perry, Ohio.
Vice chairman, Herbert J. Langshaw, Perry, Ohio.
Member, Ralph E. Shepard, Perry, Ohio.
Alternate, Frank E. Brown, Perry, Ohio.
Alternate, Paul Brockway, Perry, Ohio.

Willoughby Township

Chairman, William R. Mahon, box 442, Willoughby, Ohio.
Vice chairman, Ronald S. Parsons, Erie Road, Willoughby, Ohio.
Member, Harvey Tanner, Lost Nation Road, Willoughby, Ohio.
Alternate, H. J. Stokes, Route 1, Willoughby, Ohio.
Alternate, John A. Kusar, Lakeland Boulevard, Willoughby, Ohio.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by paying tribute to the late Hon. Sol. Bloom.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio script.

Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. McKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include telegrams.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a letter.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 151) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Thursday, April 14, 1949, for the celebration of Pan-American Day on which day remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include a speech by Mr. Kent Leavitt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Committee on Plans for Reconstruction of the Ceiling, Redecorations, and Other Improvements to the House Chamber the gentleman from New York [Mr. HEFFERNAN] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW AND PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and of course, I am not going to object, can the gentleman tell us the program for Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not the intention that the House meet on Friday. That is the direct answer, without regard to the completion of the program tomorrow, except that if possible I should like to complete the program I had for this week up until tomorrow. That includes three resolutions giving the ordinary subpena powers to three committees, the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Judiciary, and one other. The consideration of those resolutions should not take long. They will come up first.

There is also a bill out of the Committee on Armed Services in connection with personnel of the Army and the Air Corps.

Further, there is the Arab-Palestine resolution, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I am very hopeful that that program will be completed tomorrow, and that is why I am asking that the House meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow. Otherwise, there will be no further business for the rest of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a very fine statement by the American Legion before Senator PEPPER's subcommittee on the cut-back in the veterans' hospitals. I was privileged to hear this able presentation of the case by Gen. John Thomas Taylor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, veterans' organizations, veterans, and the population generally were very much shocked when the news of the statement by General Gray came regarding the cut-back—I understand he was not responsible for it—of numerous veterans' hospitals. It was an administration cut-back. I am reliably informed that this morning before Senator PEPPER's committee the budget took the full responsibility for the cut-back. General Gray has stated that he was not responsible for it. Many persons are wondering if the budget had the right to cut those hospitals back. The Congress authorized the building of those hospitals, Veterans' Administration had approved, the appropriation was ready, and it is still in the appropriation bill that is coming up for action very shortly from the Committee on Appropriations, I ascertained today. I doubt if any further legislation is necessary to insure the building of these hospitals. It seems that the will and the authority of the Congress have been thwarted in this. The need is extremely great. We will have great suffering among the ill and injured veterans if they are not built. The veterans today cannot get beds in civilian hospitals. These buildings are all ready to be erected. They should be built without a day's delay.

STATEMENT BY T. O. KRAABEL, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL REHABILITATION COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, MARCH 10, 1949

LEGION POLICY ON HOSPITALIZATION

The American Legion believes in the hospitalization of veterans by or under the auspices of the Veterans' Administration. This belief and this advocacy refer to veterans who require hospital care, who apply for it, and who are eligible. At its first national convention in November 1919 the fourth and fifth points of a program for wounded and disabled service persons read as follows:

"4. Recommend to Congress the enactment of legislation making sufficient appropriation to provide adequate hospital and sanitarium facilities for the care and treatment of all persons discharged from the military and naval service of the United States, and to provide medical and surgical treatment to any of the persons mentioned above, irrespective of the service origin or aggravation of their disability for 1 year subsequent to the passage of the act, this in addition to the medical and surgical treatment now provided by law.

"5. Request that all disabled ex-service men and women of the military and naval service of the United States be permitted to go to the best hospitals; that they be treated by their own physicians if they so desire."

Similar expressions were passed at succeeding conventions, as follows:

1921—Recommendation No. 3, committee on rehabilitation: That Congress be urged to complete its hospitalization program in accordance with the recommendations of the White committee and with the end in view that, subject to needed exceptions, all disabled men receive treatment in Government hospitals.

1923—Recommendation No. 49, convention rehabilitation committee: That all facilities of the Veterans' Bureau for the treatment and hospitalization of present beneficiaries, including transportation to and from place of treatment, be made available to all honorably discharged veterans of the military or naval forces of the United States, without regard to service connection.

1926—Resolution 16: Section 202 (10), World War Veterans Act, be amended to provide hospitalization for officers and enlisted men of Army, Navy, and Marine Corps in retirement status.

1928—Resolution 13: Hospitalization of World War veterans under section 202 (10), World War Veterans Act, be mandatory, and additional facilities, if needed, be provided.

Resolution 15: Section 202 (10), World War Veterans Act, be amended to provide that a veteran of any war, military occupation or military expedition who presents evidence of service under other than dishonorable conditions shall be entitled to hospitalization.

1930—Resolution 339: Hospitalization under section 202 (10), World War Veterans Act, be mandatory, and adequate hospital facilities for this purpose be furnished.

1931—Resolution 32: Hospitalization under section 202 (10), World War Veterans Act, be mandatory, and adequate hospital facilities be furnished for this purpose.

Resolution 43: Amend World War Veterans Act eliminating the "pauper" or "need" clauses in said act.

1932—Resolution 20: Condemns "needs clause" in veterans' legislation.

1933—Resolution 382, four-point program: Point No. 2: Federal hospitalization be afforded all veterans not dishonorably discharged who require same and are not able to reasonably pay for their own treatment.

Resolution 154: Care and treatment of war veterans is the responsibility of the Federal Government.

1934—Resolution 234: The Legion is proponent for hospitalization in Federal hospitals for disabilities not service incurred only when it is actually necessary and in cases where the veteran is unable to pay for care privately. This is a privilege granted to all citizens in similar circumstances in private or public hospitals. The responsibility for the medical care of the civilian group is in the community; the responsibility for the care of the veteran who fought for the whole people is vested in the Federal Government.

1936—Resolution 524 reaffirms the Legion's policy that hospitalization of veterans is a responsibility of the Federal Government.

The above forms a foundation upon which this organization approaches the question before this committee today.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION, 1921

The American Legion appreciates the opportunity of being heard on the crucial question of the Veterans' Administration hospital construction cut-back. We feel there is much involved, and for that reason we submit a historical summary of what the Congress, the Veterans' Administration, and the American Legion have done since the close of World War I.

The confusing and perplexing situation which existed in the years immediately following that war with reference to service to and treatment of veterans challenged not only the American Legion but also the Government itself. Early in 1921 the then President of the United States appointed a committee of prominent citizens to make a "thorough investigation and report with recommendations to the President as to what should be done to correct the entire situation." The members of that committee were: Charles G. Dawes, chairman; Theodore Roosevelt; Milton J. Foreman; John L. Lewis; F. W. Galbraith, Jr.; Mabel T. Boardman; T. V. O'Connor; Henry S. Berry; Mrs. Henry R. Rea; Thomas W. Miller; Franklin D'Olier.

The report of that committee contains the following significant and definite findings:

"Lack of provision for hospital construction to provide facilities commensurate with the proved and declared needs of the immediate future and for some years to come has been of such a degree as to prevent even the most willing cooperation among Government departments from providing hospital and medical care so distributed as to place and quality of service to accommodate the invalid wards of the Nation. It is clear that although additional beds in hospitals maintained by the several departments of the Government are available complete use of them has not been possible by reason of certain fundamental limitations, chief of which is the lack of legal authority to secure adequate medical, nursing, and other hospital personnel.

"The resources of the United States which were made available for the care of the men in the service have not yet been fully availed of or thoroughly mobilized so that the ex-service beneficiaries could have had at their disposal the best that the medical and as-

sociated professions could provide throughout the United States."

Upon the basis of these findings the committee unanimously offered seven specific recommendations, of which the fourth, fifth, and seventh read as follows:

"4. That an immediate extension and utilization of all Government hospital facilities be put into effect, together with the mobilization of such civilian medical services as may prove practical.

"5. That a continuing hospital-building program to provide satisfactory care for the disabled veterans of the World War be entered upon at once. The committee of hospital consultants appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, in cooperation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, shall submit recommendations as to the type of buildings and the location of same, the necessary appropriations to provide for such permanent program to be passed at the next session of Congress.

"7. That the $18,600,000 appropriated by the Sixty-sixth Congress for the building of new hospitals and the enlargement of existing institutions be utilized for these purposes without any delay."

Congress acted with promptitude, and on August 9, 1921, passed the law which created and set up as an independent agency the Veterans' Bureau. In the matter of providing hospital facilities and treatment it had started, shortly after the armistice, and continued to appropriate funds in response to the need and analysis as supplied by the Director of the Veterans' Bureau and later the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

It might be noted here that by 1920 the United States Public Health Service was utilizing 52 hospitals with a capacity of slightly less than 12,000 beds. These institutions were classified as follows: 37 for general medical and surgical conditions, 8 for tuberculous patients, and 7 for the psychotic and mentally ill. In addition to these Government-controlled hospitals, contracts were made with many civilian institutions in both the United States itself and its island possessions. As of June 30, 1920, there were 9,590 veterans with service-connected disabilities being hospitalized in these contract hospitals.

In 1922 all of the dispensaries being utilized by the United States Public Health Service for the examination and out-patient treatment of veterans with service-connected disabilities were taken over by the Veterans' Bureau. On April 29, 1922, the President issued an Executive order transferring the hospitals administered by the Public Health Service also to the Veterans' Bureau. In 1923 the dispensary services of the Bureau were curtailed by transferring some of them to Bureau hospitals. About this same time it was decided to abandon some of the leased hospitals as well as the temporary hospitals of the cantonment type which had been taken over from other Government agencies shortly after World War I. The transition from the old to the new Veterans' Bureau hospital system moved ahead during 1923 so that by June 30 of that year there were 47 United States Veterans' Bureau hospitals in operation.

By June 30, 1924 the number of veterans hospitalized in contract institutions had been reduced to less than 4,000, and most of these were mentally ill and being hospitalized in State institutions.

WORLD WAR VETERANS ACT

The beginning of an expanding veterans' hospitalization program was signalized by the passage of Public Law 194, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved on April 20, 1922. Section 4 of that law provided that "all hospital facilities under the control and jurisdiction of the United States Veterans' Bureau shall be available for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion suffering from neuro-psychiatric and tubercular ailments and diseases." This was enlarged by section 4 of Public Law 542, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved on March 4, 1923, by the addition of the provision "* * * including transportation as granted to those receiving compensation and hospitalization under the War Risk Insurance Act."

Referring to this law, a Veterans' Administration official in 1933 said: "At the time of this legislative enactment it was found that existing facilities were sufficient to cope with the increased demand for hospital admission." However, this whole situation evidently changed with the passage of Public Law 242, Sixty-eighth Congress, approved on June 7, 1924. This is the famous World War Veterans Act. It repealed the provisions of the War Risk Insurance Act as amended and for the most part reenacted those provisions with certain liberalizations. The most famous of these probably is section 202 (10) relating to the privilege of hospitalization in a Veterans' Bureau hospital. It provided that the hospital facilities under the control and jurisdiction of the Veterans' Bureau should be available to every honorably discharged veteran of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, the Boxer Rebellion, or the World War suffering from psychiatric, tubercular, or certain other enumerated disabilities. It also provided "that the Director is further authorized, so far as he shall find that existing Government facilities permit, to furnish hospitalization and necessary traveling expense to veterans of any war, military occupation, or military expedition since 1897, not dishonorably discharged without regard to the nature or origin of their disability; *Provided*, That preference to admission to any Government hospital for hospitalization under the provisions of this subsection shall be given to those veterans who are financially unable to pay for hospitalization and their necessary traveling expenses."

An appraisal of the effect of this law, uttered 11 years after its passage by one of the high officials of the Veterans' Administration, was as follows: "This brought about a complete change of policy with regard to the construction of additional facilities. The Veterans' Bureau was forced to plan and launch a new program of hospital construction to take care of the enormously increased load, the result of the new legislation (section 202 (10) World War Veterans Act, second sentence). A large influx of veterans of all types into Government institutions taxed the capacity of existing facilities. It then became necessary to plan a program of hospital construction which would take care of a veteran population of approximately 5,000,000 men and women."

The development of this Government established program for the care of veterans during the decade from 1924 to 1933 is marked by additional liberalizing provisions in the law, and appropriations and authorizations for expansion of the hospital construction program.

As of June 30, 1932, Congress had appropriated the sum of $118,952,000 for the acquisition of hospital facilities for veterans; and there had been expended in addition thereto $15,000,000 for permanent improvements and extensions to veterans' hospitals. As of that date there were in operation 56 VA hospitals with a combined capacity of 29,833; and 10 VA homes with a combined capacity of 19,988 beds.

Before passing on it should be noted that Public Law 536, Seventy-first Congress, approved July 3, 1930, authorized the President by Executive order to consolidate and coordinate the Bureau of Pensions, the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and the United States Veterans' Bureau into an establishment to be known as the Veterans' Administration.

ECONOMY ACT, MARCH 20, 1933

Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 20, 1933 (the so-called Economy Act) repealed all public laws granting medical or hospitalization treatment or domiciliary care to veterans who served in or subsequent to the Spanish-American War.

However, section 6 of that same law, as amended by section 1, Public Law 78, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 16, 1933, "authorized the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, under limitations prescribed by the President, to furnish to men discharged from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard for disabilities incurred in line of duty and to veterans of any war, hospitalization or domiciliary care (for permanent and certain other disabilities) pursuant to which Veterans' Regulations No. 6 series, pertaining to eligibility for domiciliary or hospital care were promulgated by the President and, as amended by Congress are still in effect. Section 29, Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 23, 1934, further amended section 6 to authorize, subject to available beds, hospitalization or domiciliary care for war veterans unable to pay the expense, regardless of service connection."

On August 23, 1935, Public Law 312, Seventy-fourth Congress, was approved. This law further liberalized eligibility for hospitalization or domiciliary care by providing "that any veteran of any war who was not dishonorably discharged, suffering from disability, disease, or defect, who is in need of hospitalization or domiciliary care and is unable to defray the necessary expenses therefor (including transportation to and from the Veterans' Administration facility), shall be furnished necessary hospitalization or domiciliary care (including transportation) in any Veterans' Administration facility, within the limitations existing in such facilities, irrespective of whether the disability, disease, or defect was due to service. The statement under oath of the applicant on such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be accepted as sufficient evidence of inability to defray necessary expenses." This basic law is still in effect.

The effect of the Economy Act upon the hospital program which became effective following passage of the World War Veterans Act of 1924 may be gaged from the fact that as of June 30, 1933, the total hospital load of the Veterans' Administration was 33,795, a decrease of 10,046 from the load at the end of the previous fiscal year. The expiration of the next fiscal year—1934—saw 40,059 veterans receiving hospitalization from the Veterans' Administration. Thirteen percent of these were hospitalized for tuberculosis; 56 percent for nervous and mental disorder, and 31 percent for various medical and surgical disablements.

DEVELOPMENT SINCE WORLD WAR II

As of June 30, 1941, Congress had specifically authorized and appropriated $165,574,267 for new hospital, domiciliary and out-patient dispensary facilities. In addition there had been expended from regular fiscal funds the sum of $25,705,721 for permanent improvements and extensions—a grand total of slightly more than $191,000,000.

As of the same date the VA was operating hospital facilities at 91 different locations in 45 States and the District of Columbia. The capacity of these institutions was 61,849 beds. In addition thereto the Veterans' Administration was utilizing 2,570 beds in Army, Navy, and Public Health institutions. The beds for domiciliary care number 18,747. Thus, shortly before World War II we find the VA with 80,596 hospital and domiciliary beds.

At this point mention should be made of the VA 10-year-construction program. This was proposed by the Federal Board of Hospitalization and approved in principle by the

President on May 8, 1940, with the understanding that the program would be reviewed annually and coordinated with conditions existing at that time. This program had as its goal the increase in total accommodations for veterans to 100,000 beds. It was estimated that this number would enable the Government to meet peak requirements for all types of institutional care. Had not World War II broken out and had this program proceeded along estimated lines, the goal would probably have been reached by 1948–49.

It was not until fiscal year 1943 that the impact of new veterans from World War II was felt in the total hospitalization load. On June 30, 1943, the distribution of Va patient load was as follows:

World War I	45,653
World War II	5,132
Spanish-American War	2,871
Other wars, expeditions, and occupations	65
Regular Establishment	2,920
Total	56,641

Just 3 months prior to the close of this fiscal year the Seventy-eighth Congress had passed Public Law 10 (approved March 17, 1943), which amended veterans' regulations so as to grant hospitalization and domiciliary care to World War II veterans on the same basis as granted to veterans of World War I.

FEDERAL BOARD OF HOSPITALIZATION

On August 1, 1943, the Executive Office of the President directed a new Federal Board of Hospitalization to serve as an advisory agency to the Bureau of the Budget. This Board was charged with the duties of analyzing and reviewing hospital, convalescent, and domiciliary activities, and programs developed and operated by all departments and establishments of the Government for the purpose of

(a) Preventing the overlapping and duplication of services and overbuilding of facilities;

(b) Ensuring the most efficient and complete utilization of the total services and facilities of the Federal Government by each department and establishment;

(c) Determining the need for existing or additional facilities of each department and establishment;

(d) Determining the area or locality in which additional facilities should be provided;

(e) Determining the extent to which non-Federal facilities may be utilized in the administration of the hospital activities or programs of any department or establishment;

(f) Developing a complete over-all program for providing hospitalization for the veterans of World War II;

(g) Furnishing recommendations with respect to such matters as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may refer to the Board.

The above will be recognized as very significant in view of recent announcements in the press and developments otherwise. No less important is another instruction given to the Board at the time it was reestablished, so to speak, which reads as follows:

"No project for acquisition of additional beds by new construction, major alteration, or leasing of or contracting for existing facilities shall be undertaken by any department or establishment until it has been submitted to and reviewed by the Board as to need, location, type of construction, and any other factor which the Board may consider pertinent to the performance of its responsibilities, nor until the resulting recommendation of the Board has been transmitted and considered * * * as approved by the President."

VA MEDICAL PERSONNEL DURING WORLD WAR II

The hospital construction program during the war years ran head-on into those factors with reference to difficulties in getting men and matériel which definitely slowed up the production of beds. Another matter of great concern during those years which had a direct bearing upon the fullness of the veterans' hospitalization program was the recruitment and training of qualified medical and dental personnel. The Administrator's report for the fiscal year 1942 sets forth that the obligations and responsibilities of the Veterans' Administration in the care and treatment of disabled veterans have required that most positive action be taken to avoid any serious impairment of service. Accordingly, arrangements were made with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy whereby qualified medical and dental officers of the Veterans' Administration might on application be commissioned in the services in an inactive status and remain with the VA. This step involved potentially about 1,800 men of medicine and dentistry, and was considered only temporarily helpful.

The report for fiscal year 1943 indicated that some of the VA physicians, despite this arrangement, had resigned and entered military service, and that appointment of physicians were made from time to time during the year but not to the extent of maintaining the required complement of personnel.

By the end of fiscal year 1944 arrangements with the Secretaries of War and Navy had developed so that qualified medical and dental officers of the VA were, on application, commissioned in those services in an active duty status and detailed to the Veterans' Administration. This arrangement also brought about the availability of services of commissioned personnel through detail from the War and Navy Departments of certain available officers qualified for duty with the VA in assignments on rating boards, etc.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

The slowing up and impairment of services to veterans, particularly in the field of medical and hospital care, prompted the special committee of the American Legion which initiated and developed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to set forth in the very first section of that legislation the designation of the Veterans' Administration as an essential war agency. This carried with it the entitlement, second only to the war and Navy Departments, to priorities in personnel, equipment, supplies, material, etc.

In the next paragrah of the law the Administrator and the Federal Board of Hospitalization were authorized and directed to expedite and complete the construction of additional hospital facilities for war veterans, and to enter into agreements and contracts for the use by or transfer to the VA of suitable Army and Navy hospitals after they were no longer needed by the armed services. Moreover, this act carried with it an authorization to have appropriated the sum of $500,000,000 for the construction of additional hospital facilities.

In the fall of 1944 the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs announced a greatly enlarged hospital construction program. Contained therein were 22 new hospitals and additional beds for 26 existing hospitals. The estimates were made for the fiscal year 1946.

Previously the Administrator had estimated that 300,000 beds would be required by 1975 on the basis of veterans coming from the two World Wars.

In May 1945 the National Rehabilitation Committee of the American Legion made certain observations in line with the famous Resolution 528 passed at the Milwaukee convention, 1941, which called for the reorganization of the medical division of the Veterans' Administration. Among these were the following:

1. The medical and hospital service of the Veterans' Administration is of such importance and proportions that it should be headed up by an outstanding man of medicine whose rank and status should be equal to that of Assistant Administrator.

2. There should be an inspired medical and hospital service, with more personal and bedside practice of medicine.

3. Chief medical officers and clinical directors should be given greater authority to run their hospitals.

4. There must be a revitalized program whereby the advancement and progress in medicine and surgery made by the armed services during this war shall be inherited and maintained by the Veterans' Administration to the end that war veterans shall have the best science has to offer for their care and treatment.

CHANGE IN ADMINISTRATORS

During 1945 Gen. Omar N. Bradley was appointed to the position of administrator of veterans' affairs to succeed Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, who was appointed Ambassador to Panama. General Bradley took over on August 15, 1945. Soon thereafter he made a new study of the 1946 construction program, made certain changes and revised it to become the 1947 hospital construction program.

In the spring of 1946 the American Legion through its national commander and the national rehabilitation committee advocated and supported the arrangement whereby military and naval hospitals no longer needed by the armed services, constructed and located so as to be of value to the VA, should be taken over by the VA. Such acquisition would be more readily accomplished than awaiting construction, and adjustments as to retaining some or all of these hospitals would be made later on as new construction was completed. Under that arrangement there are as of the present writing 36 former military hospitals taken over and being run by the Veterans' Administration. The number of authorized beds in these institutions approximates 27,000.

Under date of March 3, 1947, the American Legion medical advisory board recommended to the rehabilitation executive committee a proposed policy with reference to the location of Veterans' Administration hospitals. Our medical board pointed out the benefits that would accrue to the veteran as a result of Veterans' Administration hospitals being close to medical schools and medical centers. At the same time it was announced that this proposed policy should in no way adversely affect the arrangement of establishing smaller hospitals in well located communities so that less specialized hospital care where needed would be available.

The report on the combined 1947 and 1948 hospital-construction program as of December 31, 1948, showed only two new hospitals as having been completed during a period extending through World War II and up to the end of 1948. There were 88 new hospitals in various stages of progress, as follows:

Construction contracts awarded	31
Design completed but construction contracts not awarded	19
Design in progress	36
Design not started	2
Total	88

That was about the situation when the announcement was made that 24 projects are to be canceled and the bed capacity of 14 other new institutions is to be reduced. The reduction, as the committee well knows, amounts to 16,221 beds.

The records of the Veterans' Administration show that as of January 31, 1949, there were 126 hospitals with a standard bed capacity of 104,789 in operation. It is estimated that the projects now under construction—31 hospitals—and those in the plan-

ning stage not canceled by the Presidential order—35 projects—will produce an additional 35,246 beds. This number added to the number of beds in operation (104,789) and the approximately 2,500 to come in through additions to existing hospitals, would bring about a total of slightly more than 142,000 beds by 1952. This total, however, includes nearly 28,000 beds acquired when certain former Army and Navy hospitals were taken over. Among these are many in temporary construction which the Veterans' Administration says will have to be eliminated, so that the net total of beds of permanent or acceptable construction would be about 131,000 when the present revised program is completed. We have been told further that the elimination of these temporary beds may take anywhere from 6 to 8 years. If that takes place then there would be a period following completion of this program when we would actually witness the gradual reduction in the number of beds for veterans at a time when, according to the experience of American Legion service officers, the requests for hospitalization will be mounting.

BEDS FOR POTENTIAL LOAD

Reference was made above to the so-called 10-year construction program. This would have produced 100,000 beds at a time when the estimated population of potentially eligible veterans would have numbered 4,000,000. The bed ratio then would have been 1 bed per 40 veterans.

Another interesting item in calculating bed ratios is that supplied by the statistics available from the American Medical Association, to the effect that as of March 27, 1943, there were 1,383,827 beds of all classifications, descriptions, etc., available to the gross population of this country. This would mean both civilian and military, and would be approximately 1 bed per 100 people.

The present veteran population is given as 18,869,000, including peacetime veterans. Actuarial estimates so far available would indicate that as of January 1, 1952, there would be 18,800,000 potentially eligible veterans. If at that time the 131,000-bed program is functioning, we would have a ratio of 1 bed per 143 veterans, according to our own estimates.

If the full construction program originally approved and for which Congress had either appropriated or authorized funds were carried forth to conclusion, this country would have 145,000 beds in permanent construction for its veterans—the 1955 population of which has been projected to be approximately 18,200,000—a ratio of 125 veterans per bed. Surely this ratio is the minimum we could advocate and the minimum the Government should provide.

The American Legion wishes to point out that the Government's policy for constructing veterans' hospitals prior to World War II is evidenced by the approval of 100,000 beds by 1948–49 at a time when the number of potentially eligible veterans would have been 4,000,000—a ratio of 1 bed per 40 veterans. World War II intervened. Congress passed the law giving World War II veterans the same privilege of hospitalization as World War I veterans (Public Law 10, 78th Cong., March 17, 1943). Appropriations, authorizations, and approval for an expanded construction program were made. Now, if the present cutback is sustained and we come out with a completed program netting the country 131,000 permanent beds, the Government will have virtually added only 31,000 beds after World War II—a war in which the number of Americans participating is at least three times the number in World War I.

REASONS FOR CUT-BACK

Four principal reasons for cancellation of proposed construction were set forth in the press release of January 10, 1949. Two of these—viz, temporary hospitals taken over from the armed forces are remaining serviceable longer than estimated; and, the delay will give the Veterans' Administration better opportunity to develop a further program—are not considered basic to the essential and long-time program. The other two we wish to comment upon briefly:

1. *Inability of the Veterans' Administration to fully staff its present hospitals and a further definite shortage of professional personnel to staff new hospitals*

The American Legion is aware that there are a certain number of beds that are not being used because there are not doctors and nurses to run them. These reports have come to us from service officers and field representatives who periodically visit these hospitals. Statistical reports available to us from the Veterans' Administration show that as of January 31, 1949, 3,343 beds were not in use for this reason. Dr. H. D. Shapiro, our senior medical consultant, in exploring this question with medical men of the Veterans' Administration, was told that there is a shortage of approximately 400 physicians. This shortage is classified as follows:

Neuropsychiatric	200
Tuberculosis	40
Anesthesiology, pathology, roentgenology, neurosurgery, and other specialists	160

Although there is said to be no shortage in general surgeons, general medical specialists or ward surgeons, the Veterans' Administration holds that certain key specialists are necessary to run a hospital and to assure the best possible medical and hospital care.

The American Legion has long advocated the best there is is in medicine and hospitalization for veterans. To that end it has contributed and will continue to contribute its best efforts. It is our considered judgment that there is opportunity for this and other organizations to find out how best they might promote the means or facilities by which more doctors will become available. In fact, the executive board of the National Rehabilitation Commission last week assigned such a study to this staff.

It is interesting to note that as of January 31, 1949, there were 2,572 full-time physicians in VA hospitals and centers. At the same time there were 1,258 medical men and women in regional, district, and central offices. There were also part-time doctors serving in the hospital program. Among these are 1,123 consultants and 2,273 residents. According to information which Dr. Shapiro received, two consultants will equal one full-time specialist, and two residents would equal one, or perhaps a little more than one full-time doctor. Applying that formula to the total number of full-time and part-time physicians, we note that the Veterans' Administration had the equivalent of 4,122 doctors as of December 31, 1948, attending and serving 88,873 patients in VA hospitals.

Here are the estimates Dr. Shapiro received as to the number of doctors needed to staff beds at the end of the current and next fiscal year:

One hundred and twelve thousand six hundred hospital beds: Needed to staff full capacity June 1949, 4,640.

One hundred and twenty-four thousand five hundred hospital beds: Needed to staff full capacity June 1950, 5,220.

Dr. Shapiro pointed out that in a number of places where VA hospitals were reduced in size or cancelled in this announced cutback there undoubtedly would be part-time consultants available, and a residency training program could be introduced which would go a long way toward recruitment. It would appear that outside of neuropsychiatry the Veterans' Administration might adequately staff beds in the larger medical centers. With reference to the NP hospitals, our senior medical consultant submits that they might well be set up adjacent to centers where NP specialists are available.

In connection with the plea that the Veterans' Administration is unable to staff all its hospital beds it would be well to keep in mind that the locations of hospitals in the construction program were studied by Veterans' Administration medical men and engineers and were approved presumably after analysis of such factors as availability of doctors, nurses, and other personnel. In fact experts not only of the Veterans' Administration but also of the Federal Board of Hospitalization and the Bureau of the Budget went over and approved these sites. In the words of our senior medical consultant, "It is not only a question of building beds but placing the beds where they can be staffed."

With reference to the statement above that the Veterans' Administration considers certain key specialties as necessary to assure the best possible medical and hospital care, we would want to point out that if a fuller utilization is made of available specialists in communities where many hospitals are located this need could be met.

Another factor that cannot be overlooked is the apparent uncertainty as to what the Bureau of the Budget or Congress might do with reference to additional beds for veterans and the personnel to run them. We submit that if that uncertainty is removed and reassurance given as to what Congress has done, is doing, and will do in providing for the hospitalization of veterans, the task of recruitment of doctors and other personnel will be facilitated and expedited.

2. *Estimated possible maximum load of service-connected patients is 51,000, leaving more than twice as many other beds available to other veteran patients*

The question has been asked many times, not by the American Legion but by others who seem to have some misgivings about the program, how far does the Congress want the Veterans' Administration to go in building hospital beds for veterans? Invariably one notes in the development of answers to this question that there seems to be no doubt as to the right of the veteran with service-connected disabilities to be hospitalized for such disablements. Moreover, it seems to be conceded in most quarters by those who have considered the question that veterans suffering from tuberculosis and mental and nervous ailments should also be cared for by the Government. Private and State institutions for these afflictions are already filled, and there are no accommodations for these disabled veterans elsewhere. Out of the 65,829 so-called non-service-connected disabled veterans who were in VA hospitals on December 31, 1948, 53 percent were suffering from tuberculosis, psychotic, or neuropsychiatric ailments. Of the 28,000 general medical and surgical patients, 12,667 were World War II, 13,675 were World War I, and 1,491 Spanish-American War veterans. At this point it is suggested that there be obtained from the Veterans' Administration its most recent analysis of what percentage of patient-days is taken up by the non-service-connected general medical and surgical patients remaining 30 days or less. The last report made available to the Rehabilitation Commission was that only 8 percent was so utilized. As to the chronically ill, it is submitted that the screening of such cases would be of no particular value since most if not all of those patients are soon made medically indigent by their ailments. Can it be that all the agitation against the Veterans' Administration hospitalizing so-called non-service-connected cases is stimulated by the 8 percent, or thereabouts, of patient-days taken up by the non-service-connected general medical and surgical patients remaining 30 days or less?

Recently we asked our national field service to conduct a spot survey as to the percentage of general medical and surgical patients in VA hospitals who were there as the result of postwar accidents or injuries. The returns

indicated, depending upon the type of hospital, a percentage of less than 1 percent up to 22 percent.

Another point that American Legion service officers cannot overlook, and one which we would bring to the committee's attention, is that among the so-called non-service-connected disabled veterans requiring hospital care within 3, 4, or 5 years after the cessation of hostilities will be found many with damage to mind or body that can be traced to service. As of January 31, 1949, 48,892 new claims for disability compensation or pension were pending adjudication. Whether that represents 1, 2, or 3 months' work load in the Veterans' Administration, it does establish that at any given time there are many thousands of claims which have not been settled. As of the same date—January 31, 1949—there were 16,188 veterans awaiting hospital admission. This number represents those whose applications have been filed, acted upon, and approved. In addition to them there are many hundreds who have not filed because of the delays, or who have sought hospital care elsewhere.

Another spot survey conducted the first part of February among the 18 States affected by the proposed cut-back brought back estimates from that group alone of 17,108 in need of hospital care. Time and again have service officers had the experience of representing claimants and succeeding in establishing claims for service connection, thus changing their status from the category of the so-called non-service-connected to the service-connected. We submit that it is a precarious practice to pass upon the applications of World War II veterans especially on the basis of whether their ailments are service-connected or not when we consider the relatively short time most of them have been out of service, the varied and grueling circumstances of combat and training for combat in World War II, and the types of tropical and other insidious diseases to which they were subjected. It is our experience that currently and for some time to come the non-service-connected veterans at your doorstep today may be the service-connected ones tomorrow.

A SUMMARIZED STATEMENT OF THE POSITION OF THE NATIONAL REHABILITATION COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, RELATIVE TO THE CUT-BACK IN THE VA HOSPITAL-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, MARCH 10, 1949

The national rehabilitation commission of the American Legion is opposed to the cancellation of VA hospital-construction projects and the reduction in the number of beds for the following reasons:

1. Shortly after World War I, Congress started and since supported a program of building hospitals for veterans.

2. Congress has passed laws setting forth eligibility provisions for hospitalization (e. g., Public Law 312, 74th Cong., August 23, 1935) and Executive orders have been issued establishing an order of preference (Veterans' Regulation 6 (c)). See also VA Regulations and Procedure 6047-48.

3. The Federal Board of Hospitalization proposed, and the President approved in principle, on May 8, 1940, a VA 10-year construction program which would have produced a total of 100,000 beds by 1948-49, when the estimated potentially eligible veteran population would have been 4,000,000—or a ratio of 40 veterans per bed.

4. World War II produced over 15,000,000 war veterans, and for them the Government is undertaking to construct only 31,000 additional beds, bringing about a net total of only 131,000 beds after the current program is completed and the temporary beds eliminated—a ratio of 142 veterans per bed.

5. The complete VA hospital-construction program, initiated after the passage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, in section 101 of which Congress authorized and directed the VA to expedite construction of additional hospital facilities, was studied and laid out by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Federal Board of Hospitalization, approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the President, and authorized with appropriations or contract authority by the Congress. This program should be completed without curtailment, thus bringing into being a minimum of about 145,000 beds for a potentially eligible veteran population of approximately 18,000,000—an estimated bed ratio of 124 veterans per bed.

6. The recruitment of doctors and other personnel to man these beds can be facilitated and expedited by the removal of any uncertainties as to what Congress has done, is doing and will do in authorizing hospitals for veterans; and through further utilization of specialists and other medical talent in communities where these hospitals are located.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 16, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3150. A bill to revise and repeal certain acts relating to rules of survey to permit departures from the system of rectangular survey when necessary on all public lands, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. S. 278. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 629. An act to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3537. A bill to amend section 3 of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3538. A bill to terminate the war-tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 3539. A bill to amend the China Aid Act of 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 3540. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 so as to permit payments to aunts and uncles of the insured where the insurance matured prior to August 1, 1946, and where the remaining proceeds of the insurance would otherwise remain unpaid; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 3541. A bill to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and of the Tariff Act of 1930 to authorize the allowance of draw-back of tax paid on bottled distilled spirits and wines delivered in the United States to public international organizations, foreign embassies, etc., for consumption and use in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3542. A bill providing for the construction of a Federal building at Scranton, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 3543. A bill to amend paragraph 368 (a), section 1, title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to include counting or registering devices, mechanisms, and instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3544. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from making any contract or lease relating to golf courses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 3545. A bill to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 3546. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide retirement benefits for certain former Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 3547. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3548. A bill making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 3549. A bill to permit the Comptroller General to pay claims chargeable against lapsed appropriations and to provide for the return of unexpended balances of such appropriations to the surplus fund; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3550. A bill to exempt carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 3551. A bill to amend section 1101 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3552. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public kindergarten or kindergarten and nursery-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3553. A bill to permit the prosecution of lynching in Federal courts when the governor or attorney general of the State concerned lacks authority to direct the prosecution in State courts, or such prosecution is impaired by his refusal to do so; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 3554. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3555. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the town of Marblehead, Mass.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3556. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 (Public Law 106, 79th Cong.; ch. 212, 1st sess.); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3557. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 3558. A bill to increase to $600 the amount a dependent may earn without loss of exemption to the taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 3559. A bill to strengthen and improve the organization and administration of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 3560. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the State to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3561. A bill to clarify the effective date of the repeal of the manufacturers' excise tax on musical instruments sold for the use of religious or nonprofit educational institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 3562. A bill to provide reimbursement of emergency medical expenses incurred by certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3563. A bill authorizing acquisition and interception of communications in interest of national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 30,000 copies of the document entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go," and providing for distribution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 30,000 copies of the document entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go," and providing for distribution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 30,000 copies of the document entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go," and providing for distribution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 30,000 copies of the document entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go," and providing for distribution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 150. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the report made to the Appropriations Committee on the subject of Federal power policy; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, requesting an appropriation of not less than $2,000,000 to be made available to the United States Corps of Engineers for the completion of the Coos Bay improvement project, Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, requesting the enactment of proper legislation designating November 11 as Veteran's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 3564. A bill for the relief of George Schecter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 3565. A bill for the relief of Earl B. Hochwalt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 3566. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey to Lester S. Kortright certain real estate at Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 3567. A bill for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 3568. A bill for the relief of Elfrieda Seeger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 3569. A bill for the relief of Lew Hirshman and Mrs. Essie Hirshman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3570. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Raffloer Droesse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

236. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. Joseph Peek and Mrs. Domanic Biondi, chairmen, and other citizens of Colfax, Iowa, urging that any Federal aid to education bill which discriminates against non-public-school children by denying them health and welfare benefits be defeated; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

237. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Lt. Robert P. Grover Post, No. 377, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Jersey City, N. J., urging that the Congress of the United States eliminate discriminatory provisions of present laws admitting aliens to the United States by passing corrective measures; to wit, the proposed legislation of Senators McGRATH and NEELY and the bill of Representative CELLER; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

238. By Mr. HOLMES: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, relating to the relocation of secondary State Highway No. 11A through restricted areas of the Hanford Engineering Works; to the Committee on Public Works.

239. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Frances Jacobson, president, Kings County Council Ladies' Auxiliary, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the extension and strengthening of rent controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

240. Also, petition of E. S. Willoughby, chairman, Moiese Valley Grange Committee, Moiese, Mont., stating opposition to a Columbia Valley Authority or any other authority where the destiny of the people within the region is vested in a few men; to the Committee on Public Works.

241. Also, petition of H. C. Curtis and others, West Palm Beach, Fla., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

242. Also, petition of William C. Knopp and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

243. Also, petition of Mrs. Harry W. Putman, Malden, Mass., asking for the passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, February 21, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor, Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art man's unfailing friend and the God of all wisdom, we pray that we may find a just and righteous solution to the problems of human relationships. In our plans and purposes may we have the interpreting and guiding light of Thy divine spirit.

May we be true, for there are those who trust us; may we be humble, for we know our weakness; may we be brave and strong, for there is so much to do and many members of the human family are finding the struggle of life so difficult and their burdens so heavy.

Grant that at the close of each day we may have a peaceful conscience and a heart that is happy with the blessed assurance that we also are having a part in the final triumph of the Kingdom of God.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 315. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui;

S. 335. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon;

S. 592. An act for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson;

S. 594. An act for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed-credit account;

S. 632. An act to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments;

S. 633. An act for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno; and